

Merile H. Stevenson,  
 Augustus Paris,  
 Chester E. Orcutt,  
 Louis B. West,  
 Denzil R. Fowls,  
 Forest J. Ashwood,  
 George C. Buzby,  
 Augustus H. Fricke,  
 Edward M. Butler,  
 Thomas J. Caldwell,  
 Louis E. McDonald,  
 George H. Townner, jr.,  
 Robert A. Cobban,  
 Stephen E. St. George,  
 Louis Cukela,  
 James M. Burns, jr.,  
 Emmons J. Robb,  
 Allan S. Heaton,  
 Erwin F. Schaefer,  
 Daniel D. Thompson,  
 Wilbur Summerlin,  
 Charles F. Commings,  
 Walter W. Wensinger,  
 Robert O. Williams,  
 John T. Stanton,  
 Virgil P. Schuler,  
 Harry S. Davis,  
 Peter P. Wood,  
 Lawrence E. Westerdahl,  
 David N. Richeson,  
 Merle J. Van Housen,  
 James C. Leech,  
 Richard S. Ross,  
 Vinton H. Newell,  
 Emmitt R. Wolfe,  
 Stephen A. Norwood,  
 Raymond A. O'Keefe,  
 Frank M. Cross,  
 George W. McHenry,  
 Gale T. Cummings,  
 Charles W. Holmes,  
 Samuel H. Woods,  
 Wilbur Eickelberg,  
 Robert A. Butcher,  
 Allen J. Burris,  
 Earl M. Rees, and  
 Carl Gardner.

Maj. (temporary) Arthur P. Crist, retired, to be a major in the Marine Corps on the retired list.

Maj. (temporary) Thomas F. Lyons, retired, to be a major in the Marine Corps on the retired list.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, July 15, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, give us, we beseech Thee, the courage, the strength, the fortitude to cast out the demons which are lying in wait to enter and corrode the soul of man, such as egotism, covetousness, jealousy, hate, revenge, and all that brood of vipers which follow in their wake; that we may develop the angels of love and good will.

"Love never faileth; but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away.

"For we know in part, and we prophesy in part.

"But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away.

"When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things.

"For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known.

"And now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; but the greatest of these is love."

Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege, the highest privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his question of personal privilege.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, during the debate yesterday on the prohibition enforcement bill, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] used the following language, which appears on page 2572 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, July 14, 1919, to wit:

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the first two words. I am opposed to this amendment unless the gentleman from Kentucky will provide that the inspector and agents visit the House Office Building. Then I will vote for his amendment. Before this debate is concluded I shall ask that every Member of Congress who votes dry on this proposition be honest to his country and his conscience and that he place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the amount of liquor that he has saved up for himself either in his home or in his office. If the Congress wants to be on the level with the country, it will do as I ask. The country is told that this Congress is overwhelmingly dry. I have been a Member of this Congress since 1914, and I have found it overwhelmingly wet. Now, why—why, in the days when you are making the world safe for democracy and freedom—why tie up the individual unless you are willing, Members of Congress, to tie up yourselves? I have heard, Mr. Chairman, of Members of this House who have said that they have in their private wine cellars enough liquor to take care of them and their friends for 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, I submit respectfully that this is a reflection upon the integrity and the standing of every Member of this Congress. It gives out to the world—and so the morning papers report—that while the Members of Congress are seeking to place prohibition upon the people of the country the Members of this House have stored away, even in their offices in the House Office Building, a Government institution, if you please, enough liquor to last 20 years for the private use of themselves and their friends.

I submit that it is an unwarranted aspersion upon the standing and the integrity and the dignity of this House, whose Members are as strictly sober as any 435 men with whom I have ever been associated before.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is disposed to think, on the question of what is the privilege of the House, that there is a line of wavering degree. The Chair is disposed to think that the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] were not an assault upon the privileges of this House and that the gentleman is not in order.

Mr. BLANTON. Would the Chair recognize me to offer a motion to expunge those unwarranted and unfair remarks from the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. That is not in order. The House has its remedy for that.

Mr. BLANTON. You can not do it in the committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is not a question of privilege.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2395. An act amending section 25 of the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, as amended by the act approved September 7, 1916;

S. 180. An act for the incorporation of the Near East Relief Association;

S. 715. An act for the relief of the Atlas Lumber Co.; Babcock & Willcox; Johnson, Jackson & Corning Co.; and the C. H. Klein Brick Co., each of which companies furnished Silas N. Opdahl, a failing Government contractor, certain building materials which were used in the construction of Burke Hall at the Pierre Indian School, in the State of South Dakota; and

Senate concurrent resolution 5.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 50,000 copies of the treaty with Germany in the English text alone and without maps, 10,000 of which shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 40,000 for the use of the Senate.

## SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 715. An act for the relief of the Atlas Lumber Co.; Babcock & Willcox; Johnson, Jackson & Corning Co.; and the C. H. Klein Brick Co., each of which companies furnished to Silas N. Opdahl, a failing Government contractor, certain building materials which were used in the construction of Burke Hall, at the Pierre Indian School, in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2395. An act amending section 25 of the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, as amended by the act approved September 7, 1916; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Senate concurrent resolution 5.

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That there be printed 50,000 copies of the treaty with Germany in the English text alone and without maps, 10,000 of which shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 40,000 for the use of the Senate—

to the Committee on Printing.

#### SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I submit a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa submits a privileged report, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas submits a privileged report from the Committee on Rules, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved.* That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. , being a bill "making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes"; that the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with; that there shall be two hours of general debate, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] and one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]; that at the conclusion of the general debate the bill shall be read; that on the reading of the bill no amendment shall be in order except germane amendments to the following paragraph, which paragraph is made in order on page 19 of said bill:

"Vocational rehabilitation: For an additional amount for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes,' approved June 27, 1918, as amended, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding to be done at the Government Printing Office, law books, books of reference, and periodicals, \$6,000,000, of which sum not exceeding \$15,000 may be expended for rent of quarters in the District of Columbia if space is not provided in Government-owned buildings by the Public Buildings Commission: *Provided*, That no person (except the members of the Federal Board for Vocational Education) shall be paid by said board out of the appropriation contained in this or any other act at a rate of compensation exceeding \$2,500 per annum and rates above that sum, except not to exceed the following: One at \$5,000, 2 at \$5,000 each, 23 in excess of \$3,500 and not in excess of \$4,000 each, 27 at \$3,500 each, 70 at \$3,000 each, 60 at \$2,750 each, and 100 at \$2,500 each."

That at the conclusion of the reading of said bill it shall be reported to the House with such amendments as may be made to the paragraph specified as being subject to amendments. Thereupon the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman this: What do we want with any two hours' debate on this thing?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, suggested two hours of general debate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What are we going to debate?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I assume to make some explanation of the hearings that were held, covering a period of more than 12 hours and covering some 150 to 200 pages on this general subject. I assume that it is for the purpose of making an explanation to the House of the paragraphs that are made in order on the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It seems to me every man in the House knows what this proposition is, and every man in the House has made up his mind on it, and every man should vote to sustain the veto.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The time need not be consumed if the Members do not desire to use it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to ask the gentleman from Kansas or the Speaker, one or the other, or both, what about the veto? We are not going to take this thing up before we vote on the veto, are we?

Mr. GOOD. The veto message has been referred to the Committee on Appropriations and is still in that committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know; but you have got to vote on it.

Mr. GOOD. Not necessarily.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The veto message defeats the bill, if the House does not reconsider it. The Committee on Appropriations have reported out a new bill with a new number for the consideration of the House, and have taken it up de novo.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is the same old bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes; but it is introduced under a new number and is to be considered de novo in the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Is it not imperative to vote on the veto?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not. The veto message came to the House. The Constitution provides that there shall be consideration of the bill. The House referred the message and bill to the committee. Now, if the committee brings out a bill in accord with the suggestion of the President's veto and the House passes it in that form, it seems to the Chair action on the veto itself is not required. The Chair will look that up.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How do we come to be considering this proposition now when no attention is paid to the veto?

The SPEAKER. The veto message, with the bill, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations. Now, that committee has reported out a new bill. The veto message and the original bill are still slumbering in the Committee on Appropriations, and the Chair thinks—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It seems to me this way, if the Chair will permit: We pass a bill in due form and the President vetoes it, and the veto is the only excuse that we have for going into this proposition that is brought in here by the chairman of the Committee on Rules. It seems to me the Constitution is imperative. It says that when the President returns a bill to the House in which it originated with his veto, immediately the House shall reconsider the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding. Now, for the sake of convenience, in days gone by the House has juggled with that word "immediately," and I am not insisting on the liberal dictionary meaning of it now. They have postponed action from time to time, and some of the veto messages were sent to committee and never reported back.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman contend that the action of the House in voting to refer the bill, with the veto, to the Committee on Appropriations is not such reconsideration as is contemplated by the constitutional provision?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why, no. The constitutional provision means that you shall consider that veto and pass on it, and the only excuse that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] and his conferees have for bringing in this rule is that the veto ought to be disposed of first.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does not the Constitution simply require that the bill which is vetoed shall be reconsidered?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course it does, but it has never been reconsidered; and the Constitution provides, further, for the calling of the roll, and those in favor of reconsideration vote yea and those opposed to it vote nay, and it is the only place in our system of government where you must call the roll. There has been no constitutional disposition of it at all. The roll has not been called.

Mr. DUPRÉ. We have got two sundry civil bills before the House at one time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So the upshot of the whole thing, as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DUPRÉ] suggests sotto voce, is that we have two sundry civil bills before us at one time, or will have if this rule reported by the gentleman from Kansas prevails.

Mr. DUPRÉ. They have introduced another sundry civil bill, with the veto pending.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We have another sundry civil bill introduced, with the veto pending, as the gentleman from Louisiana says.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Then, if the House should override the veto of the President, the bill would be passed?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course. As the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE] suggests, if the House should override the veto, why, then there would not be a particle of sense in this performance introduced here by the gentleman from Kansas. It would be an absolute superfluity.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman will look at paragraph 105 of the Manual, he will see that a motion to refer a vetoed bill, either with or without the veto message, has been held allowable and within the constitutional mandate that "the House shall proceed to reconsider." I think the distinguished gentle-



man from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], when he occupied the high place of Speaker of the House in the Sixty-fifth Congress, followed that precedent in the case of a vetoed bill by suggesting that a motion to refer was within the direction of the Constitution that it should be reconsidered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The question never was raised when I was Speaker, and I want it understood once more that I am not bound as a Member of the House by what I did as Speaker, [Laughter.]

Mr. WALSH. I think that may be fortunate for the present House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the decisions on this point are clear. In Hinds' Precedents, section 3550, it says:

A motion to refer a vetoed bill, either with or without the message, has been held allowable within the constitutional mandate that the House "shall proceed to reconsider."

And, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] states, there have been many cases where bills have been referred to a committee and no further action has been taken upon them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Chair will permit, that was simply to get rid of the bills.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the reason of the rule and the reason of the constitutional mandate are fully observed by the action that was taken in this case. Of course, the purpose is that the President's will shall receive the consideration of the House. If the House by a two-thirds vote overrules the President's veto, that defeats the will of the President, and therefore it is provided that that shall be done by a roll call; but in the present instance the committee, as the Chair is advised, have reported, conformably with the suggestion of the President, a new bill, so that all the House has to do, if it does not desire to act in accord with the President, is to defeat the bill which now comes forth, and that defeat can be accomplished, not by a two-thirds vote but by a majority vote, so that in this case the purpose of the Constitution to allow the will of the President to be expressed is being carried out more completely than by the technical yea-and-nay vote, upon which two-thirds are required. At any rate, the precedents fully justify the action of the committee. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to ask the Chair—

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think after the Chair has ruled there should be further discussion.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to ask the Chair a new question. What becomes of the direction in the Constitution that there shall be a yea-and-nay vote on it?

The SPEAKER. As the Chair said, it has been decided a number of times that by referring the bill to the committee no further action need be taken upon it. It has been decided by a long course of precedents, as the gentleman from Missouri is aware. The committee can report it back and then when the bill is before the House it requires a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. WINGO. If the logic of the Speaker is correct, would not we find ourselves in this situation: You dispose of the veto of the President without a record vote of the House, and would not you dispose of the veto by a majority vote instead of a two-thirds vote?

The SPEAKER. If the House wants to bring the veto before it, all it has to do is to discharge the committee.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recognized to make a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas has the floor on the rule.

Mr. WINGO. Is it not a privileged motion? That is the subject matter of the President's veto; we are acting on a constitutional matter, and is it not true that the highest privileged motion is in order at any time during the proceedings?

The SPEAKER. Exactly; but that is not now before the House. The President's veto and the bill are in the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WINGO. The committee brings in a new bill, which is not privileged, which makes this rule necessary, and is it not a matter of higher privilege to move to discharge the committee, and has it not been so decided?

The SPEAKER. That might be, if the gentleman had the floor, but the question before the House now is on the rule.

Mr. WINGO. If that be true, you can defeat a question of the highest privilege by the Rules Committee coming in and cutting that out. So that a motion of the highest privilege would be set aside by one not of the highest privilege. In other words, you would hold that the rules of the House supersede the Constitution, which I contend is not logical.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the Committee on Rules having submitted this privileged rule, if any gentleman wishes to make a motion suggested by the gentleman from Arkansas, that can be brought before the House by voting down the rule.

Mr. WINGO. The only desire I have is for orderly procedure. Would not that be doing in an indirect way what we might do directly; would it not be a better parliamentary procedure, and be safer, and resolve all doubts in favor of the construction of the Constitution to pass first on the veto? Frankly, I should vote against passing it over the President's veto, but I think we ought to go very carefully and be sure to carry out the constitutional mandate. Would it not be a quicker procedure to pass on the President's veto and then if we override the President's veto that settles it. If the House fails to do that, the Rules Committee can bring in this rule and make the new bill in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes that there is much merit in what the gentleman says, but the Chair thinks that this accomplishes the very purpose the gentleman himself says he desires, and that is that the President's veto shall not be overruled. This motion accomplishes the same end without calling for a vote on the President's veto. It simply eliminates one step in the proceeding. It seems to the Chair that this is the quicker way to accomplish that very end. It may have been that when the President's veto was up it would have been better that the House should have voted upon it, but then if the House had failed to sustain the President's veto it would have gone to the committee and then come back just as it comes in now. That was not done; the original bill is not before the House, but is in committee. It seems to the Chair that while that might have been a more orderly manner, yet this has precedents and support and accomplishes the same end and eliminates one step.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DEWALT. Is not this an attempt to sustain the President's veto by the action of the committee in reporting a bill consonant with the President's views instead of either sustaining the veto by a vote of the House or rejecting it?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think that is a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KINCHELOE. In case the rule is defeated, what is the method of procedure for securing a vote on the presidential veto?

The SPEAKER. The committee could report it out or the House could discharge the committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations having had referred to them the sundry civil appropriation bill with the President's veto, took the President's veto as final on that bill, and asked the Committee on Rules for a rule for the consideration of a new bill providing for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the ensuing year, and this resolution is to make that bill in order. I ask the gentleman from North Carolina how much time he desires on the rule.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I suggest 20 minutes on a side. I have had some requests for time that I did not have when I first spoke to the gentleman about this.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, then I ask unanimous consent that debate upon the rule be limited to 40 minutes, 20 minutes to be controlled by myself and 20 minutes by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that debate on this rule be limited to 40 minutes, 20 minutes to be controlled by himself and 20 minutes by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I make a further request for unanimous consent that at the end of the 40 minutes the previous question be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask a question on this proposition. The rule as brought in by the Committee on Rules provides for two hours of general debate, one half of that time to be controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the other half by the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. Did the Committee on Rules take into consideration the fairness and equity of that, in view of the situation and the conflict of opinion, and consider at all the question of allowing any of that time to be controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Education, which committee is primarily interested in this proposition?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Education is a member of the Committee on Rules and was present when this rule was considered. He then made no suggestion other than the usual suggestion as to the division of time between the majority and the minority members of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Reserving further the right to object, I would ask the chairman of the Committee on Rules if he would consider the propriety of himself offering an amendment



to the rule giving those who may be opposed to the amendment brought in by the Committee on Appropriations an opportunity to control at least a part of this time? We have no assurance, in view of the language of the rule, that those of us who may desire to oppose the amendment will be given any consideration whatever in this debate.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, in response to the request of the gentleman from Alabama, I would say that it has been customary in cases of this kind for both the minority and majority members of the committee having the bill in charge to yield time to any Member of the House who may be especially interested in the measure under consideration, either for or against, and I assume that that arrangement can readily be made in this case.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. FESS. Reverting to the statement about no request being made in the Committee on Rules, I recognized the usual custom of the two sides of the aisle being given the control of the time, and the equity that is always shown to Members who are for or against the bill under consideration. For that reason I took it for granted that there would be no advantage taken on either side.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It is always the assumption in the Committee on Rules that there will be a fair division of time between those opposing and those favoring the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. The only bill to be considered now is the new bill that has been introduced?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. That bill is not printed so that the Members of the House may have access to it or have a copy of it, and I submit the point of order to the Speaker that it should be out of order to consider legislation when the membership of the House has not had the privilege of seeing a copy of the legislation which we are to consider.

The SPEAKER. It may be that perhaps it would be well that that should be in order.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it in order to object to the consideration of this until the bill is printed?

The SPEAKER. It is not. Perhaps it should be, but it is not.

Mr. BLANTON. It is not printed, and we can not get a copy of it.

Mr. CANNON. This rule settles it. That is what the rule is for.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARD. I notice in the reading of the rule that there was no number given the bill under consideration. Is it necessary that a number be given to the bill?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The number will be given by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk reported the bill as H. R. 7343.

Mr. GARD. I did not hear it reported.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has brought in this rule for the consideration of the bill, providing for the reading of the bill without amendments, except germane amendments to the provision providing for the educational rehabilitation of our returned soldiers. This is the only unusual feature of this rule. We justify ourselves before the House for that unusual provision of the rule by the fact that the House has recently considered the sundry civil appropriation bill in its entirety as it is contained in the bill made in order by this rule, with the exception of the provision to which amendments are made in order. Otherwise the rule is not unusual. We made this provision in order to expedite the passage of this very important measure. The activities of the Government are practically suspended. Many of the activities of the Government that are now under operation are in operation in violation of law, and it is a very serious question whether or not the action taken by many of the departments of the Government within the last few days will not be entirely unlawful and so declared by the courts if the question be raised. It is for the purpose of making ample provision for the rehabilitation of our disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines and provision for the operation of the Government that we are anxious to expedite the passage of this bill, and therefore we bring this rule in as now provided.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, the President vetoed the sundry civil appropriation bill because of the inadequacy of the appropriation to continue the great work of the Federal Board for Vocational Education. In response to the veto of the President the Committee on Appropriations held supplemental hearings and has reported legislation the consideration of which is provided for by the rule which the House is now considering. As this was a unanimous report from the Committee on Appropriations, I imagine that the objections set forth in the President's veto have been satisfied. This vocational education should not be made the subject of too rigid economy. The work of this board is something of which every American ought to be proud. [Applause.] These wounded soldiers should be liberally dealt with. Every one of them should have \$100 a month while he is being educated. Those with families should receive more. If this legislation does not satisfy the objection raised by the President's veto, I imagine that we will hear from the President again. Inasmuch as this is a unanimous report and inasmuch as the officers of the Federal Board for Vocational Education have appeared before the Committee on Appropriations, let us hope that this legislation is such that this board can continue its benign work to the end that every one of these wounded soldiers may be given an education such as he prefers by the Government of the United States at governmental expense. [Applause.] I reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman reserves 17 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the rule.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Wingo].

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I trust the House in its anxiety to proceed will not set a precedent that may rise to plague us in the future. The committee has reported a new bill, and it frankly admits this is a new bill, and bringing in this rule has admitted it is not a question of privilege, and it is accompanied by the remarkable statement of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL]. I desire the House to consider that statement when it comes to vote on this rule. As I now recall the statement—and if I do not quote the gentleman correctly he can correct me—he said that the Committee on Appropriations treated the veto of the President as final. By what authority does any committee of this House treat a veto of the President as final?

Under the Constitution it is made our duty to determine whether a veto of the President is final, and the only jurisdiction—the gentleman will find precedents, although I have not time now to call attention to them—the only jurisdiction the Committee on Appropriations had was to make recommendations to the House whether or not it should sustain the President's veto. Now, the orderly procedure for this House to do and for the committee to have done would have been to have reported back the vetoed bill, not the new bill, but reported back the vetoed bill with recommendation to the House as to whether or not it would advise the House to sustain or reject the President's veto. That is the orderly procedure, gentlemen. If you do not adopt that procedure, you will find yourself coming to this conclusion, that the rules of the House—

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield for a question? I want to ask the gentleman—

Mr. WINGO. Let me finish my statement. I repeat, if we follow the present proposed procedure, if you let the statement of the gentleman from Kansas go as final as the action of this House that the committee, and not the House, under the Constitution shall determine whether or not the veto of the President is final, you establish a dangerous precedent, and you establish that the rules of this House are superior to the Constitution. The only people who can treat the veto of the President as final is the Congress through solemn proceeding. You must act upon a roll call. Suppose we adopt this procedure to-day and pass this new bill. This House will never carry out the constitutional mandate to pass upon a President's veto. What will happen? I imagine from the reading of this text that the gentlemen are going to get around one of the objections of the President. I am not prepared to say now whether I shall vote to do that. I will be frank to say that I am strongly tempted to do that. As I heard the reading of the proposed amendment they propose to get around one of the objections of the President by changing the limitation. In other words, the House then will by a majority vote override the President's veto and put up to him a second time that which the President has vetoed once. Gentlemen, we can not afford to do that. I am in sympathy with the President's veto. We all want to get quick action. Now, let us vote down this rule. And I shall move, if I can get recognition, to discharge the committee from further consideration. Then call the roll and I will vote to sustain the veto of the President. Then there will be no objection made to the



unanimous consent for the gentleman from Iowa to bring in the new bill, but if there is objection, then the Committee on Rules can make it in order and the House can preserve an orderly procedure.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. WINGO. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think that the rule is this: When a veto message of the President is submitted that any Member of the House has the right to refer that message with the bill to the proper committee, and any other Member of the House who is in favor of passing the bill notwithstanding the President's veto has perfect right to offer a motion to pass the bill notwithstanding the veto, but if no Member—

Mr. WINGO. I think the House has acted properly in line with the precedents. It can refer any question to a committee for recommendation. The House by its procedure referred the veto message to the committee for its recommendation, and that committee ought to come back to this House with the recommendation that it either sustain or vote down the recommendation of the President. If we sustain the veto, then we can bring in a new rule and preserve the constitutional procedure.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I shall not permit the observation of the gentleman from Arkansas to pass without notice. The gentleman is very much exercised because the veto of the President was not challenged by the Members of the House and voted upon. There was an opportunity for that vote when the message arrived and was submitted to the House.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. When I conclude the statement. The House observed the practice that has been in vogue for more than a century and that was observed within the past two years in this House. The President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, on the 22d day of August, 1916, vetoed a public land bill. That bill, together with the veto, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and those two measures, the bill and the veto, still lie slumbering in the Committee on Public Lands without a vote or any action whatever on the part of the House on the veto.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. And the gentleman from Arkansas, I believe, was a member of that committee.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Just as soon as I refer to another bill and veto.

Mr. WINGO. My question was on the other matter.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield for a question.

Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman think it sufficient answer to say that a former Congress failing to obey a constitutional mandate to go on record on a presidential veto justifies this Congress doing it?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I think the former Congress observed the law and the rules of the House in the action it took.

Mr. WINGO. If we take this procedure to-day, will the gentleman tell me what will become of the President's veto?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Exactly the same thing that became of the President's veto on the Army appropriation bill. On August 18, 1916, that bill, together with the veto message of the President, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and four days later a bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs making appropriation for the Army and passed the House without a record vote. The gentleman from Arkansas was then a Member of the House.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman is reciting past history. I am asking what will happen now? Will we ever have a vote on the President's veto under the Constitution if we follow your procedure?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No; no more than we had a vote on the veto when the President vetoed the Army bill and the land bill in 1916. If the House had decided to challenge the veto of the President on the Army appropriation bill of 1916, the vote would have been taken immediately by roll call. If the House had desired to challenge the veto message of the President on the land bill, it would have done so by a record vote immediately upon the veto message being laid before the House together with the bill. In this case the House Committee on Appropriations has accepted, and the House is about to accept, the veto message of the President as final so far as the sundry civil bill is concerned, and is reporting out a new bill, according to precedent, providing for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the next year.

Mr. WINGO. The Chair ruled otherwise to what the gentleman has stated. Objection was made the other day and the Chair overruled the gentleman's objection and insisted, over

The objection of the gentleman from Kentucky, that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] had a right to move to refer it to the committee. So it was challenged at that time, and the Chair ruled, and very properly, that we had a right to ask for a recommendation of our committee before we acted on the veto of the President.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The House acted entirely within its rights in referring the bill and the message to the Committee on Appropriations. We could have voted down that motion. Then the vote would have been taken on the veto message of the President.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL].

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, of course I think it is a real recognized fact that this whole procedure is just simply a subterfuge of the majority side of the House to keep from going to direct vote on the President's veto message.

Now, I do not blame my friends on the other side of the House very much for trying to "duck" this issue, to use a slang expression. Our friends in the majority, in preparing legislation to take care of wounded and disabled soldiers, evidently did not take proper precaution in the way of appropriations to do that. The President called the attention of the country and of the House to the fact that the majority had been negligent in that regard. And I believe it was upon yesterday that the Republican House sustained a veto of the President. Naturally the majority does not want to get into the daily habit of having the Republican majority on the floor of the House sustaining the vetoes of the President. It is a fact that this whole procedure, the Committee on Rules coming in here with a rule to-day, is almost exactly what the President demands; but the orderly procedure, as pointed out by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO], would have been much better. It would have been a more manly way to have met the situation to have disposed of the veto message and then come in with a rule and then with the bill and have passed it in the regular way.

Of course, the gentlemen on that side are responsible for the legislation. I am sorry that they did not measure up to the requirements when they had an opportunity to provide sufficient money to take care of disabled soldiers.

It devolved upon the Democratic President to use the great power of the veto to bring the majority side to its senses. And, of course, I congratulate my distinguished friend, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for his ingenuity and wisdom in mapping out a course that will prevent his side from going to record on a fair show on a roll call, as practically every man on that side would vote to sustain President Wilson on this veto. I think the country is familiar with the situation, but I simply wanted to emphasize the fact and call the attention of the public to the way in which they are undertaking to get around and not meet the issue.

It is a well-known fact that every man in the military and naval service of the country and their friends should bear in mind that if it had not been for the veto power exercised by President Wilson the Republican Party would not have given the soldiers and sailors the recourse to which they are entitled. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CANTRILL. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. The Democratic House of Representatives passed the sundry civil bill and it went to the Senate. It did not become a law.

Mr. UPSHAW. Why?

Mr. CANNON. That bill made no more favorable disposition for vocational education than does this bill. [Applause on the Republican side.] Claptrap! Claptrap! [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that the Senate had no chance to pass upon the bill because of a filibuster by the Republican Senators, who not only killed this bill but many other bills, which required an extra session of Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. But if the gentleman will yield further—

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. A Democratic Congress, in February or early in March, passed a sundry civil bill with a less provision than is contained in the bill we passed. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. CANTRILL. Just a moment. May I have one minute more?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANTRILL. I would like to answer the question of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LAYTON. Just one question.

Mr. CANTRILL. In reply to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] I will state that a Democratic House did pass all the requirements demanded by the department at that time when the bill was under consideration. The demands are much larger now than they were then.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman yield? The gentleman does not want to make a misstatement, I am sure. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CANTRILL. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that he is mistaken about that. The estimates made for this service in the regular Book of Estimates were for \$4,000,000, and the only appropriation made by the last Congress for this purpose, a Democratic Congress, was \$2,000,000. This Congress has already appropriated \$6,000,000 for this purpose, and this bill carries \$8,000,000 more. Those are the facts in the case. Post up! Get the facts! [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CANTRILL. These differences could easily have been worked out between the two Houses if the filibuster had not occurred. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GOOD. Post up! Post up! [Applause and cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, how does the time stand?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas has 15 minutes, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] has 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. How many more speeches has the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. POU. One speech of five minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I wish the gentleman from North Carolina would use his time.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, I care nothing at all about the question as to whether this vocational bill as now proposed to be amended was passed by the House and failed in the Senate, nor do I care what the provisions are, so far as the amount in the bill is concerned, because that is water that has passed by the mill. The question before us, and to my mind the important question, is an orderly manner of proceeding, and with due deference to the decision of the Speaker I maintain that this rule being now considered is not in order.

Now, what are my reasons therefor? In the first place, I do not think anyone will contradict the basic proposition that when a bill is vetoed by the President of the United States it must be returned to the House in which it originated, with the veto message, and immediately thereafter it shall be considered and a vote is to be taken as to whether the bill shall pass, notwithstanding the objections thereto. That, as the ex-Speaker, Mr. CLARK, has already said, has been construed to mean that the consideration can be postponed even indefinitely.

Now, what has been done here? When this veto message came into the House with the bill attached thereto it was by the House referred to the Committee on Appropriations. Now, what does the Committee on Appropriations do? It comes back to the House with what? With a new bill, not with the old bill, not with the bill which was to be voted upon and determined upon as to whether it should be passed by a two-thirds vote, notwithstanding the objections of the President, but with an entirely new bill, so far as we know. Therefore I maintain that, although it is said that this new bill is in consonance with the objections of the President of the United States, it is sustaining the veto of the President by the action of a committee, and when that committee reports the bill to the House the House can vote upon it, and by a majority vote determine that the sustenance of the veto by the President shall be maintained.

Now, that is clearly, if there be anything of force in the language of the Constitution, a violation of the provisions of the Constitution. It deprives the House of voting by a two-thirds vote on the veto message, and gives the right to the House to affirm that message or negative that message by a majority vote. If you get beyond that, you get beyond the Constitution itself. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the use of poison gas in warfare was first undertaken by the Huns at the beginning of the Great War. It has never so far received the sanction of the civilized world. But there seems to be a disposition in certain quarters to adapt those tactics to legislative discussion, and so we have a variety of gas explosions here this morning in regard to a matter that is as clear as any feature of the procedure of the House of Representatives. Gentlemen attempt to establish smoke barrages, behind which they hope to conceal their real partisan purpose and intent.

Now, the fact is that there are three motions that can be made when the President returns a bill with his veto—a motion to consider forthwith, a motion to postpone to a day certain, and a motion to refer to committee. And all those motions have been made from time to time since the foundation of the Government, and this is the first time, so far as I know, that anyone has ever raised a question in regard to the validity of any of them.

If the gentlemen on the other side who are agonizing because the House did not do the perfectly senseless thing of voting on a veto message relative to a provision which it expected to amend, practically in accordance with the recommendations of the President, had felt that way when the matter first came before us, they could have either made the motion for immediate consideration or they could have voted down the motion to refer to the committee. They did not even ask for a division. So far as the RECORD shows, the action of the House was unanimous, as I recall it, on the motion to refer to committee—a motion very frequently made; a motion made on that side within the last two years with regard to a great supply bill providing for the Army of the Union. It went to the committee, and exactly the same practice was followed as was followed in that case, when my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], was in the chair as Speaker, and when a great majority of the men now sitting on that side were here as Representatives in the former Congress, as has been followed in this case.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. What was done with the bill?

Mr. MONDELL. It was taken up for consideration, and it was considered, just as this bill will be considered. The only reason why any rule is necessary in this case is to expedite the consideration of this bill. We happen to be operating under another rule, which makes it difficult to get in even with a privileged bill from the Committee on Appropriations. Furthermore, this bill has not been printed, and therefore could not be considered until to-morrow without a rule. Therefore, in order to serve the public interest and have this bill reenacted as soon as possible, it has been necessary to bring in a rule; and the minority members of the Committee on Rules used very good judgment and patriotism in the Committee on Rules by voting for the rule, as they have shown their very poor judgment since the rule was reported. They have proceeded to argue now for the first time the new and strange heresy propounded by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO]. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The question being taken on ordering the yeas and nays, 21 Members seconded the demand.

The SPEAKER. Twenty-one Members, not a sufficient number.

Mr. WINGO. I ask for the other side, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman demands the other side. Those opposed to taking this vote by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety in the negative. Twenty-one is not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused. The resolution is agreed to, and the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7343) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, with Mr. TOWNER in the chair.



The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has one hour, and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], has one hour. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for one hour.

Mr. GOOD. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, we are about to consider a bill providing for the sundry civil expenses of the Government in lieu of a similar bill vetoed by the President. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], will make a statement with regard to the details of the paragraph toward which the presidential veto was leveled. I do not propose to discuss that matter in detail, but propose to discuss for a very few moments the general question of this particular veto.

The sundry civil bill was signed by the presiding officers of the two Houses on the 1st day of July. The President did not act upon it until the 11th, by the veto, which arrived here on the morning of the 12th. He vetoed the bill on the ground that the appropriation of \$6,000,000 for vocational rehabilitation was not sufficient, and that there were certain limitations contained in that item upon the amount which might be paid for high salaries, which he claimed would hamper the work of rehabilitation under the paragraph.

We are none of us challenging the President's constitutional right to veto legislation. It is not only his right to do it, but it is his duty to do it when he feels justified in taking that extraordinary action. But so far as my experience goes, this is the most extraordinary and unusual presidential veto we have ever had. There may have been presidential vetoes in the past on the ground that a certain item of appropriation was not sufficient, where the right to create a deficiency was unquestioned, but I do not recall any such veto, and I doubt if there ever has been such a veto up to this time.

There may have been presidential vetoes in the past on the ground that Congress was not providing for salaries sufficiently high, but if there have been I do not recall them. I do not know of a case, have not been able to find a case, where a President has vetoed a bill on the ground that the Congress has not provided large enough salaries. These are the two grounds of the veto before us. If the bill had not been vetoed, no one has any doubt but that the work of vocational rehabilitation would have been carried on in the largest possible and most liberal way, because every dollar of the \$6,000,000 carried in the bill was available for use as soon as it was needed and when it was needed.

The right to create a deficiency was unquestioned, and if the \$6,000,000 had been needed within a month or two months or three months it could have been used, and Congress would have responded promptly and willingly to any request for a deficiency appropriation to carry on the work. It is true that with regard to these gentlemen whose salaries were about to be reduced they might have been temporarily separated from the public crib and pay roll, some of them, or their salaries of \$5,000 and \$4,000 and \$3,500 might have been reduced somewhat, temporarily at least, until such time as the President might have communicated with the Congress, calling attention to the necessity, as he saw it, if he did see it, to increase the salaries of these officials. No President, so far as I recall, has ever vetoed an appropriation bill because of the alleged insufficiency of an item where a deficiency could be legally created, and no President, so far as I know, has ever heretofore vetoed a bill on the ground that the salaries provided were not high enough.

If it be true that this appropriation is not sufficient for the entire fiscal year, that matter would have been provided for by a deficiency appropriation. If it be true that some of these gentlemen are entitled to \$5,000 instead of \$4,000, or to \$3,500 rather than the \$800 or \$1,000 or \$1,200 that they used to earn in their usual vocations, that fact could have been presented to Congress without the veto of a great supply bill. During the period of the Great War we passed Army and Navy bills that carried but a fraction of the sums needed and used for military and naval purposes, but were any of those bills ever vetoed on the ground that the appropriation was not great enough? The ordinary appropriation bills carried hundreds of millions of dollars. The deficiency appropriations for this same service carried tens of billions of dollars. The President must know and the President does know that through a deficiency appropriation all needed funds would have been provided for, without the extraordinary action of vetoing this tremendously important supply bill.

This Congress in 37 working days passed through both Houses, securing the signing by the presiding officers of the

two Houses, seven great bills that had failed in the preceding Congress. The President was not at the seat of government and could not sign them, and from the 1st of July up to the time action was finally taken on these bills practically every activity of the Federal Government was in dire jeopardy lest something might occur to prevent the enactment of these bills into law. Until the President acted, the multiplied activities provided for under this bill, from Panama to Hawaii, from the Arctic to the Virgin Islands, were in questionable circumstances, and still all these activities would have been validated had the President signed the bill.

But when he failed to sign it, these activities, wide flung as are our possessions on land and sea, involving the employment of hundreds of thousands of people, in the most important services under the flag, were left without legal sanction, and to-day so far as they have operated from the 1st of July have been operating without warrant or sanction of law, a condition which has never existed under our flag from the foundation of the Government to this time.

What are some of these activities? The Panama Canal and all of the work on and in and about it; the activities of the Alien Property Custodian; the maintenance of all the Federal penitentiaries; the Coast and Geodetic Survey; the Coast Guard; the Emergency Fleet Corporation as provided for in this bill; the Federal Trade Commission; the great work of flood control along the Mississippi and on the Sacramento Rivers; the activities of the Geological Survey and the Lighthouse Service; many of the most important activities of the Bureau of Labor; all of the activities of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing; the National Park Service and all of the wide-flung public-land services; the Reclamation Service; the work on rivers and harbors as provided for in this bill and on public buildings from one end of the country to the other; the maintenance of St. Elizabeths Hospital, where 4,000 of our unfortunate boys are being cared for; and the maintenance of soldiers' homes throughout the country.

By reason of the veto of this bill all of these activities, so far as they are being carried on, are now absolutely without any warrant of law so far as employments are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Can I have five minutes more?

Mr. GOOD. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. MONDELL. This bill carries an appropriation of \$53,000,000 for military and naval family allowances of soldiers; \$75,000,000 for military and naval compensation of soldiers and their families. Not a dollar of these sums can now be legally paid. Not a dollar of them has been paid legally so far as it has been paid since the 1st of July. But in order that the Congress may have its attention called to the salaries of a few gentlemen who do not want to be separated from the public crib, in order that the attention of the country might be called to the fact that there is a possibility of a deficiency six or eight months from now in one item, all of these great appropriations for our soldiers and our sailors, their wives, widows, and orphans, are nullified, held up, deprived of legal sanction.

Why, even the flunkies at the doors of the White House are employed, and have been since the 1st of July, by reason of this veto without warrant of law. If there is anybody being paid there now he is being paid contrary to law and employed contrary to law.

If the Panama Canal is carrying commerce to-day it is doing it without legal sanction for expenditures. If they are taking seals at the Pribilof Islands they are doing it without warrant of law. If they are surveying lands for settlement they are doing it without warrant of law. If they are paying the widows and orphans of soldiers and the crippled soldiers themselves they are doing it without warrant of law.

I would regret to express on the floor of this House my honest opinion as to the motives, purposes, and intent of this absolutely unnecessary and unjustifiable veto of a great appropriation bill. [Applause on the Republican side.] Tying up the activities of the country everywhere for the alleged cure of something that is curable, if it needs cure, through the ordinary processes of the Government and without recourse to this revolutionary procedure. If the President had been at the seat of government when this bill was passed and had wanted to veto it, it might have been done without creating this condition of chaos and confusion. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman is cheered by his side of the House when he says that it is an unnecessary veto. Why did not the gentleman move to pass it over the President's veto? [Applause on the Democratic side.] If it is such a clear case as the



gentleman says it is, and wholly unnecessary, why did not the gentleman give us the opportunity to pass it over the veto?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Texas is a very shrewd, smart, astute gentleman, and he does not believe in this veto any more than I do. In his heart of hearts he knows there is such a thing as taking advantage of an opportunity to appear to be doing something for folks when you are not doing it. That is the answer to his question. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the speech just delivered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] would have been a very good speech opposing this veto, but it comes too late. The trouble is that the gentlemen on the Republican side of this House who passed this bill originally over our insistence to increase the appropriation to rehabilitate our crippled soldiers did not want to toe the mark and vote on the question of the veto, because the President's veto is right and proper. That is all there is to this hullabaloo here to-day; merely that and nothing more.

I am more in favor of this veto than I have been of any veto message the President ever sent to this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am in favor of doing everything possible for the comfort and prosperity of the American soldiers, especially those who are wounded or crippled in battle. There was nothing secret about this thing. This is not the first time that a message was ever referred to a committee, but the case that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] cited is not parallel to this. That message that he was talking about was referred to the Committee on Public Lands for the purpose of killing it in the committee. Nobody had any idea of killing this veto, and it ought to have been put on its passage and those who were in favor of it given a chance to vote to uphold the veto.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. What was the reason for referring the President's veto of the Army appropriation bill in 1916?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not remember. There are lots of things that I do not carry about in my head.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. In that case the veto message, together with the bill vetoed, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and four days later a new bill was reported back and passed without a roll call.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is true. I do not remember the circumstances of the case.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is a parallel of this case.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The principal part of the speech of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is a whine against the President of the United States. His objection or criticism divides itself into two parts. The first is that the President went to Europe and the second that he vetoed the bill. I am going to give my opinion about both matters. The President of the United States had as much right to go to Europe as he had to go to Baltimore. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I said that from the start. There had grown up in this country the delusion that the President of the United States could not go outside of the country, and when President Taft and Gen. Diaz met on the bridge at El Paso, and each one stood on his own side of the fence and they had some kind of a confabulation down there—that performance confirmed that delusion in the minds of the American people. The gentleman from Kansas has a bill or a resolution or something of the sort providing that no President of the United States shall leave this country. I suggest to him that he is locking the barn after the horse has gone. [Laughter.] No other President except President Wilson ever went to Europe or anywhere else outside of the country.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. And never will.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Maybe never will, but that resolution or bill—which is it?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. A bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of the gentleman from Kansas is not intended to be passed. It is intended to be an indirect assault on Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let me tell you something that I remember that happened some years ago. When I think of it it makes me wonder that the gentleman from Kansas did not bring in a resolution censuring Woodrow Wilson for leaving the United States, because he, Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, when Col. Roosevelt was in the very zenith of his power and fame, had the courage to stand up here on the floor of the House and take President Roosevelt's hide off in pieces as big as a saddle skirt, and when he got through

with that speech I told him that if it were proper for Congress to do so, if Congress had any jurisdiction over the case at all, I would be glad to move that Marshall Ney's name be stricken out of history as the bravest of the brave and the name of the gentleman from Kansas inserted in its place. [Laughter and applause.] Why did not the gentleman live up to the reputation for courage that I have given him? I do not know.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I waited until the President's return from his mission to Europe.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will tell you what you want, every one of you over on the Republican side. You want to find some kind of fault with the President of the United States.

Mr. KNUTSON. May I not suggest to the gentleman that the President is making it very easy for us to do so?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, no; he is not. You are entirely mistaken. The President of the United States has more power than any man on the face of the green earth.

Mr. KNUTSON. Too much—too much!

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Perhaps he has too much; but he has it. That is the main fact. While you Republicans have a majority of 43 in the House and a majority of 2 in the Senate, still you lack a good deal of having the coin of vantage in the political fight that you are precipitating in this House from day to day. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I have not always agreed with President Wilson, and I never do agree with everything that any man who ever lived does, and never will. Men with brains in their heads and courage in their hearts do not have to agree with any particular man about everything that he does and everything that he asks. [Applause.] When I have differed with him I have come out into the open and fought like a man, taking all the slander, lies, and filth which editors, hoping for some reward, could heap on me. I have not sidled in and sidled out as the gentleman from Wyoming and his followers are doing to-day. When I think he is right I propose to support him, tooth and nail. I shall give him the benefit of the doubt every time as to whether he is right or wrong. If he is palpably wrong, I shall fight him or any other man that ever sits in the White House. Certainly the great Republican Party does not propose to reduce itself simply to a concentrated growl. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] That is exactly what you are all doing. The whole speech of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] was nothing but a growl, and he is getting to be the greatest growler on the American continent, bar none. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Anybody can find fault. That is one of the easiest performances known among men. Any plug can go out with an ordinary telescope and find spots on the sun. They are there; they have always been and always will be, but notwithstanding the spots the sun continues to warm and light and fructify the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You can talk all you please about spots upon the present President of the United States, but notwithstanding the fact stands forth that by the verdict of the civilized world he is the foremost man in all the world. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UPSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. For a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield me an additional five minutes?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield the gentleman from Missouri five minutes additional.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I did not hear what the gentleman from Georgia said.

Mr. UPSHAW. It was just a friendly question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If it is friendly, all right. I did not start out to pass any eulogy on President Wilson. He needs none. Like Daniel Webster said about Massachusetts, "There she stands and you can judge for yourselves," and there is not a man in the House who has any respect for his own reputation, both for intelligence and veracity, not a single one, who will deny that by the universal suffrage of America he stands at the top of the heap. Now, if any of you want to deny it I will stop long enough to hear you deny it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, about this veto. Of course, it is sidetracked by the committee, and we will never get a chance to vote on it now. I have great respect for the Speaker, but I think he ruled wrong; but that does not make any difference here or there. What we want to do, and I believe the Republicans, the bulk of them, want to do toward this particular proposition, is to give all the money that is needed to take care of and educate these wounded soldiers. [Applause.] And as far as I am individually concerned, I thank God the President vetoed that bill. [Loud applause.] I yield back the remainder of my time.



The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back three minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Tennessee to yield some time.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, when we had up for consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union the sundry civil appropriation bill carrying an item of \$4,000,000 for the purpose of administering the powers of the Federal Board for Vocational Rehabilitation of wounded soldiers I had a rather earnest colloquy with some of the members of the Committee on Appropriations upon the assertion made by me, and vouchsafed for by other members of the Committee on Education, that the amount carried in the bill, especially as reported back by the conferees after an agreement with the conferees on the part of the Senate, was totally inadequate for the emergent need of that great organization, and I challenged the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], the chairman of the committee, at that time to state categorically whether or not he was in a position to assert that in view of the testimony before his committee up to that date he was willing to give to the House the assurance that the sum of \$6,000,000 finally agreed upon, in view of all the appropriations, was ample for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the amendment to section 1 of the original act and also the general administrative purposes of the board as provided for in the original act.

I asserted then that it was impossible for those figures to come up to the necessities of the situation, for the reason that a few days prior to that occasion this House by unanimous vote had passed a law amending section 2 of the original act by the terms of which law the Federal Board for Vocational Rehabilitation took over under their exclusive jurisdiction from the Bureau of War Risk Insurance at that time approximately 4,000 additional soldiers, making a sum total in anticipation of their immediately giving at that time something over 7,000 men. It was then, as it is now, gentlemen of the committee, a mere matter of mathematics, based upon the pay of \$80 a month for single men and \$100 for married men, to establish that the appropriation of \$6,000,000 carried by that act amending section 2 was only sufficient for the purposes of that amendment, and it did not make any provision whatever for all the other general expenses of the board at that time.

Mr. DEWALT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. My time is limited; ask a brief question.

Mr. DEWALT. Are there not practically now 14,000 instead of 7,000? Is not the pay increased from \$80 to \$85 for single men and to \$115 for married men?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I was coming to that, and I thank the gentleman for the suggestion. Gentlemen, when we passed this original bill creating this great department of our Government, a new adventure in the history of our Republic, we did not imagine the great scope that it was going to take, we did not imagine the great area, so to speak, of the beneficence of this legislation, and we did not reasonably anticipate the great number of wounded and disabled men who would come under its provisions. At that time it was estimated that the maximum number of all of our wounded and disabled who would come under the provisions of the bill for all time would be 10,000 men, and up to this date, gentlemen of the committee, as suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT], and, as carried out by the testimony before the committee, they already at this date have under their control, or will have very soon, for vocational rehabilitation practically 14,000 wounded and disabled soldiers, and at the rate of \$100 a month, an average for 14,000 men, it is simply another matter of mathematics for you to see that this appropriation of \$12,000,000 we are providing for here by this amendment is not going to be sufficient to carry out the purposes of this great law, and that hereafter this board will have to come back to Congress for additional appropriations. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], the leader of the Republican Party upon this floor, made a vigorous criticism of the President of the United States for sending in this veto; but, gentlemen, I submit for your consideration that the contention of those of us here upon this floor when this matter was up that this money is needed—as a justification and vindication of the righteousness and justice and humanity of the President of the United States action in vetoing this appropriation—is the fact that the Committee on Appropriations has brought in a bill sustaining his position as to the amount required, and very largely liberalizing the restrictions upon the amount of salaries to be paid.

But, gentlemen, in its real essence and analysis this is not a partisan question, and I think it is rather to be regretted that

any element of partisanship should come into discussion of this great proposition. These wounded and disabled soldiers are the wards of this great Nation until they have received fully and completely the benefits of this legislation, and every Member of this House is, in his duty here, a trustee of their interest, and upon a fair and legitimate presentation of the fact showing their necessities, called upon to vote every dollar, not in a stingy, miserly way, but, upon the contrary, in a generous and, I am almost tempted to say, an extravagant manner if necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I would like two more minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield two more minutes to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Gentlemen, I think it unfortunate that the restriction upon the salaries should have been fixed. I believe sincerely in the integrity, and not only the integrity but in the wisdom and ability and honesty of those men who are administering this great law. I have no personal interest in any of them. None of them, I believe, comes from my section of the country at all. But they have been men called into the service in this emergency in this great cause, many of them against their real will. Take the case of Dr. Prosser, the director, and he is still, as a matter of fact, superintendent of that great Dunwiddle Institute, out in Minnesota, and it is only by the courtesy of the board of trustees of that institution that his services are temporarily assigned to the Government of the United States. They talk about his salary. He was getting, as president of that institution, the sum of \$10,000 per annum, his salary from the Government. If you will make an investigation, you will find that there are a number of these other men who are selected for their capacity, for their excellence of knowledge upon these questions that necessarily go into consideration in making them capable of administering this law, and that they are men who in private avocations and pursuits earn equally as large amounts of salary as those they are now paid.

Under the limitation of time I can not discuss the provisions of this amendment minutely. I rejoice in the interest, at least in the temporary interest, in the wounded and disabled and handicapped and stricken young men of this Republic, who have become so in the service of the flag. Because we stood up here and pleaded in their behalf the other day, we rejoice in the President's veto, which, as indicated by the report brought in by the committee, has resulted in doubling the amount, and we trust will suffice for a large part of the fiscal year to carry out the necessity of caring for those soldiers. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DONOVAN].

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman and gentleman, first I want to pay my respects and compliments to the Committee on Appropriations. I believe it realized that it made an error and that it has tried to correct it. I do not think that a discussion whether the request for the appropriation was made in a certain form, or how it was made, enters here. I do not think that any action that has been taken up to this time has any particular weight; that is, such action as is against the bill.

It seems to me it reduces itself to this simple proposition: This great Government of ours, by this Congress in its enactment, has decided that it is going to rehabilitate the soldiers. It is a problem, a definite problem, and with it there are certain avenues and elements. What are they? You are either going to carry out and solve that problem for the benefit of these men and, secondarily, for the benefit of our country, or you are going to put a quietus on it. My opinion is that you are going to solve it.

Now, what is the problem? To-day there are 5,200 crippled men in training. What does that mean? It means that those 5,200 men will be employed, or engaged in receiving that training, for an average of 10 months. Does it cost anything for the training? Yes. How much? The tuition is \$17 a month, and by reason of an amendment of the second section of the war-risk insurance act there was transferred an appropriation and a duty and a function which belonged to the War Risk Insurance Board, to the Vocational Board, and made a law here, which said that during the training period of these crippled men they must be supported.

The bill brought in here asked for \$75, but this House in its discretion and judgment, which I think wise, enacted a law, which has been signed by the President and is now on the statute books, which gives to the single man \$80 and gives to the married man \$100 a month, plus his tuition of \$17 a month, and, for 10 months' training at \$117 a month, for a year it totals \$1,400. Plus that \$117 a month to the married



man there is allowed by allotment \$15. If he perchance has one child, he is allowed \$10 additional. If he has two children, the second child is allowed \$7.50; if he has three children, \$5 for the third child, and \$5 for every succeeding child. The single man is allowed \$80 without dependents, but if he has dependents—and while it may seem a misnomer for a single man to have dependents, it is a fact that he has them—he is allowed for his parents \$10 each, and then a gradation down, for his brother, \$5, and it goes on down until it reaches his father-in-law. So you can see that the average, where there is a dependent of any of these men, goes from \$80 to \$117 a month. Twelve months' training equals \$1,400. Now, there are actually being trained 5,200 men. Multiply that number by \$1,400, and see what the total is. It will go considerably over \$6,000,000. When the appropriation was asked for by this board at the last time the sundry civil bill was being considered, it was approximated on this basis. Then the War Risk Insurance Board gave but \$35 for support during training, and they averaged \$40. There were 7,000 men then ascertained to need training. There were 3,000 actually in training. Four thousand of those men were waiting transfer from the War Risk Insurance Board to the Vocational Board, and your act in amending section 2 accomplished that. That was \$90—\$60 for support and \$30 was estimated during the training for tuition. Seven thousand multiplied by \$90 gives you what? It gives you \$6,300,000. The board came in and asked for \$6,000,000. At that time, my friends, there were but 3,000 actually in training, and this was estimated. What has transpired since? There are now awaiting survey and waiting for training 8,500 men. These men are to average \$100. Multiply that by the number—

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOVAN. No; I have but little time. The gentleman is well prepared to take care of his part. We are friendly. I will state only facts.

Now, what has this country done? What is Canada doing? Canada has a problem, my friends, of 40 per cent less men in training than we have. We have nearly 14,000 men ready now.

There have been surveyed 98,000 men by this board. Canada, with her seven thousand and odd men in training, has appropriated \$32,000,000, and we have now ready for training approximately 14,000, and we are expected to do the physically impossible thing with but \$12,000,000 appropriated.

These funds, my friends, go only to the training and to the support of these crippled men during training. What are the expenses all of which are vital and necessary? There is the traveling expenses of disabled soldiers, emergency medical care, mechanical appliances, salaries and traveling expenses of employees, rent of district offices, equipment, printing, supplies, expert medical service, and communication. In fact, this \$12,000,000 will not provide for these and many other things the board is required to do in the registering, surveying, medical examination, training, and placement of disabled men.

Now, much has been said here about the staff of this organization. I want to be perfectly frank and honest. Each side of the House indulges in it—I do not know what you would call it; it may be politics or it may not be—but whatever it is it is mixed with insincerity, and it has no candor to it, and it does not stand the light of day if there is anything in the administration of this department which needs investigation—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DONOVAN. May I have five minutes more?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. DONOVAN. It is the fashion now to investigate everything, and if there is anything to which exception can be taken in the administration of this department let us investigate and let us not whitewash it or do an injustice. If we find anything wrong, do not stop with an elaborate report which leads nowhere, such as we heard here in regard to the National Security League, but let us seek an indictment. Let us see who these "terrible men" are, as has been suggested by innuendo. Are they broken down political hacks or not? What are the requirements for the work? Can you take a chauffeur out of a car and have him administer this department? Can you take a man out of a ditch and put him at it? My opinion, gained by observation and investigation, is that you must have trained executives.

I never heard of Dr. Prosser and never saw him until he came before our committee. He impressed me as a capable man. He is an educated man, president of a Minnesota col-

lege, an expert in this line, and a pioneer in the upbuilding of the disabled man; he is efficient, practical, earnest, and sincere. Sometimes these qualities are not all welded in a man of superlative education. Then there was Dr. Chandler. Who is he? He has been selected as the president of William and Mary College, and he was Dr. Prosser's assistant, giving his services at a nominal compensation for this most noble work. Who is Dr. Munroe? He is a prominent and successful Massachusetts business man. Who is Mr. McIntosh? He is a member of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, appointed with the then Cabinet members, with two other distinguished Americans, by the President of the United States.

Gentlemen, let us be honest with them. Do you mean to tell me these men are not men of the highest caliber? If they have surrounded themselves with a staff or a kitchen cabinet, unworthy of the exalted position which they occupy in the administration of their sacred trust, let us see at once the wrong is righted. But if they are such men as I describe, let those in this House that are unjust and unfair forever hereafter desist. We have a problem here, an earnest one, and I often think that the facts have not been sufficiently explained. I know that a Member of another body in this building made a reference in error that the Vocational Board had another appropriation of \$5,500,000 for the training of soldiers. It is a fact that there is such an item in the Army appropriation bill. It is for the training of soldiers, oh, yes; but not for these soldiers. It is not for the rehabilitation of disabled and crippled soldiers. It is for the normal soldier man. Our great Government made that an attraction to bring them into the Army, and then to make them mechanics and electricians and efficient in numerous branches of the arts and sciences.

In conclusion I want to say to you, gentlemen, that before the committee of which I am a member, the Committee on Education, there is pending a bill authorizing the appropriation of \$100,000,000 for the eradication of illiteracy, for the development of Americanization, for the developing of equal opportunities in this great country, and yet when this \$12,000,000 is asked for we hesitate and halt. I would vote \$150,000,000 for a proposition to give education and the retraining of men who are not educated and who answered the call of their country and went to battle and returned maimed and crippled, to take them off the human scrap heap, where they would otherwise be thrown as human derelicts or outcasts, and give them an opportunity of hope and spirit, again make them a worthy part of the Commonwealth, make them of advantage and value to their country and to themselves.

Nineteen million dollars is the lowest amount that this rehabilitation problem can be operated on for the present year, and the balance between \$12,000,000 and that sum will soon be demanded of your committee. I know that it and no other succeeding body of men is knowingly going to cripple this work when the appropriation for it is asked, or where it is asked, or what clothes a man wore when he asked it. It is a problem in this country, and every man here is for it, and will vote for the appropriation, and I say, "Go to it, and God bless you all for doing it." [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman [Mr. DONOVAN] who has just left the floor. We are all agreed, I am sure, on the general proposition under consideration. There is not a man here but wants to do everything that is necessary for the rehabilitation of these valiant men.

We should remember, however, as was suggested by the majority leader a while ago, that Congress is in session and will be in session, and that this is a matter where a deficit can be allowed, and where a deficiency bill can be brought in later. Any effort that may be made here to fasten upon anybody, either Democrat or Republican, a desire to appropriate too little for this great and worthy purpose I am sure is altogether unwarranted. I know that every man here feels, in the language of the great Master of men, that not one of us is worthy to stoop down and loose the shoe latches of one of these men who placed his life upon the altar of his country.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have a keen appreciation of the intelligence of the American soldier, and therefore I fear not from his judgment and understanding of this question any effort that may be made here to attempt to discredit anyone on this side of the House, because it seems that possibly not enough was appropriated for this great and worthy purpose.

The intelligent, efficient American soldier can detect a camouflaged political veto just as readily as any Member of this House.



They know that an additional appropriation could have been made within a week at any time, and would have been made, for this purpose. I do not think that the soldiers of this country, from the days of the Civil War down to the present, have any question in their minds as to who have been their friends, and who will provide amply for them at any time necessity requires. They will not discredit men in this House for seeking to keep down unnecessary appropriations on all lines when there is a deficit of from \$2,000,000 to \$4,000,000 a day in the public Treasury, and when men in every line of industry are clamoring for a reduction of taxes. We are glad and anxious to do everything that is necessary, and we shall do everything that is required. I believe with those who have already expressed the same conviction on this floor that the exercise of the veto power at this time, holding up all these great appropriations and handicapping so many branches of the Government, was unwarranted, and that it would have been far wiser to approve this measure and trust to Congress to meet the deficit when it should occur.

Each Member here knows that this Congress will provide from time to time every dollar that is necessary for the full and effectual rehabilitation of every American soldier.

Mr. GOOD. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, Dr. FESS.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, there is one item in the amendment reported that I would like to have modified if it does what I am sure it does, and which I do not believe the committee intended it to do. It is that paragraph which says that no person except the members of the Federal Board for Vocational Education shall be paid by said board out of the appropriation contained in this or any other act.

The words "or any other act" would cover the Smith-Hughes Vocational Act, and would exclude the present director of the Vocational Board of Education, who is not a member of the board.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that on Sunday the committee held a hearing, and it was stated in that hearing that the present director intended to resign his position, and that \$6,000 was all they were going to require for any salary, that that would be the limit, and that is one reason why the matter was carried as it is.

Mr. FESS. I regret to have that information, that Dr. Prosser is going to resign from this board. My acquaintance with him is of many years standing, and I know he came here at a great loss in salary. Until recently he received \$10,000 a year, and a change was made to cut it to \$7,500. Now, this cut to \$6,000 would, of course, lose him to us if he had not decided voluntarily to retire. I do not care to take any time to eulogize an individual. It is not a matter of legislation, and therefore I do nothing more than simply to express regret at the information I have just received, which is very sudden and surprising to me. I did not know that we were about to lose him.

The Vocational Board is embarrassed over the rapidly increasing demands for its work, that were not known when it began to work. For example, I have a letter which indicates that \$6,000,000 would be all that would be required for this work. That was written at a time when the soldiers had not yet returned from Europe in great numbers, and the amount of work was not well understood; but there are 5,200 soldiers now in training, and 8,500 more whose claims have been approved. That would make nearly 14,000 soldiers who are ready to take the training, and at a very conservative estimate it will go away beyond the amount that is here allowed. I am perfectly frank to state that the amount is beyond anything that I had in mind when I introduced the other bill.

Some are inclined to criticize, on the basis that the work is growing too rapidly. If there was no limit to this I would be in the same attitude of suspicion, but the growth is limited by the number of disabled soldiers, and I do not want to be a party to any legislation on the basis of economy that would deny training to any disabled soldier, no matter how many there are or how large the amount is. [Applause.] For that reason I desist from any criticism of the board for asking for the additional amount, and at the same time I share the desire of the Committee on Appropriations to hold it within reasonable bounds. But it is our business here, with the facts in mind, to act according to the latest intelligence that we have.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to my friend.

Mr. DENISON. I agree with what the gentleman has stated, and I was wondering if the gentleman from Ohio had found anyone in this House who really differed with him on that proposition, and who was not willing to appropriate liberally or who wanted to economize especially for this line of activity.

Mr. FESS. I agree with my friend from Illinois that there is no disposition on the part of anyone to cut off the needed training. There has been some misunderstanding as to the facts. When we were considering the bill before, I confess that my mind was not entirely clear as to the magnitude of the demands of this work, and when the chairman of the Appropriations Committee reported that the sundry civil bill carried a certain amount, and indicated that it was a duplication, that statement immediately confused the minds of a good many of us. However, it is not a duplication. Our bill which passed the House the other day carried \$6,000,000. This is \$6,000,000 more, making \$12,000,000 in all for the use of this board, and that is not as much as the present demands would seem to indicate. That is, if we have 14,000 maimed soldiers ready for training, and would put them immediately in training, it will take more than the amount that is allowed. But I am perfectly willing to rest in the conviction that the Congress will meet that additional amount under an urgent deficiency bill if it is presented, and the facts are shown that it is needed. For that reason I am inclined to support the report of the chairman of the committee, with the full intention of doing everything in our power to take care immediately of those who are in need of training. With that statement, with a keen intensity of feeling of what we ought to do, I do not hesitate to vote for the bill as it has come before the House at this time. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. UPSHAW].

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I stand for the man on crutches [applause] not because I happen to be on crutches myself, but because there is a pathos of appeal in any man who faces life with a handicap. If a crowd of newsboys on the street come to me to sell papers, the little fellow who is crippled gets the sale of even more than one if I happen to have the change.

I want to emphasize what was said by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS]. If it be true that the highest salary to be paid to the man at the head of this vocational training has been reduced to only \$6,000, I am heartily in favor of increasing it. I believe that any man who is big enough and great enough to direct a work as great as this ought certainly to receive as much pay as any Member of this Congress. If Dr. Prosser, to whom such high tribute has just been paid by the gentleman from Ohio, was commanding \$10,000 a year as an expert before coming to this vocational training leadership, this Government ought not to expect such sacrifice of him. We owe our wounded soldier boys the best that money can buy.

We are inspired to do our best for these soldiers when we think of so many men and women who have fought their way through life with a handicap, and have been a blessing to the world. When we think of how the greatest history of Mexico was written by Prescott, a man who was blind; when we think of Alexander H. Stephens inspiring this House and ruling his State from the throne of his rolling chair; when we think of Joe F. Sullivan, of Arkansas and Michigan, brilliant editor of the Hospital School Journal and author of "The Unheard Cry," who can not walk a step; when we think of Fanny J. Crosby, blind from childhood, writing songs for the comfort of millions of hearts on earth, and which, I think, must be sung among the hosts of the redeemed; when we think of our honored colleague, Mr. SCHALL, of Minnesota, who leans on his staff and with sightless eyes catches visions of beauty and of patriotism that make him an inspiration to us all; and when we think of these brave spirits who were willing to give their all, who come back to us with armless sleeves or staggering on crutches or with sightless eyes, reaching their hands to the Nation for which they were ready to give their lives, I want to go on record, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, as standing for everything, and perhaps a little more, that these brave boys need. When one faculty is lost the others are intensified, and it is wonderful and inspiring to contemplate how a man who has been maimed in body can have his remaining faculties developed in power and efficiency, but expert training is necessary to that development, and I stand unequivocally for this appropriation, and for anything else that may be necessary to help these brave heroes under handicap do their efficient best for themselves and for the Nation that loves them so well. [Applause.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska, Mr. BANKHEAD, and Mr. DONOVAN had leave to revise and extend their remarks.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the gentleman from Wyoming saw fit in his remarks to criticize the President for having vetoed the sundry civil bill on account of the fact that it failed to carry what he considered a sufficient appropriation for the rehabilitation of the soldiers. And yet the gentleman from Wyoming, by his support of the amendment proposed by the Committee on Appropriations raising that ap-



proprietion, indicates his entire concurrence with the President in the fact that the former sundry civil bill failed to carry a sufficient amount for the rehabilitation of the soldiers. As has been suggested, entertaining the views expressed on the floor of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming, instead of asking that this bill be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, should have immediately asked the House to pass the bill, notwithstanding the veto by the President. His support of an increased appropriation is in itself an indorsement of the veto of the President and entirely inconsistent with his recent remarks.

As a matter of fact, all of the public activities to which the gentleman from Wyoming refers, are being carried on at the present time. We know that there will absolutely be no hindrance or let-up in this work. It is true there is at the present time no appropriation for the maintenance, but everyone understands that this bill will become a law in a few days, and that there will be absolutely no embarrassment in any of these activities.

The statement has been made to the effect that under a Democratic House in February last only \$2,000,000 was appropriated for this identical purpose. The bill which passed the House in February carried an appropriation of \$2,000,000 and made available the \$2,000,000 that had theretofore been appropriated. It appeared at that time that the needs of the Vocational Board were only \$4,000,000.

I think the report of the committee was \$1,500,000 and the committee raised it on the floor of the House to \$2,000,000. There was no objection made on the part of anyone that that sum was insufficient, and so far as I know there was no objection on the part of the Vocational Board. The facts are that at that time, as it is now, the Vocational Board was not in a position to say just how much money they needed. A Member has only to read the hearings held by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations last Sunday to ascertain that fact. As a matter of fact, when the Committee on Appropriations reported the bill at this session of Congress it reported an appropriation of \$4,000,000 for the Vocational Board, and that was all that they were asking under authority of law. It is true that they had sent a letter to the chairman of the committee, in which they indicated they might need \$8,500,000. But so far as I have been able to ascertain the Vocational Board, up to the 1st of June, believed that they would not need more than \$8,500,000.

Mr. QUIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. QUIN. Could not they have come in at any time before a succeeding Congress and got all they needed?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But does the gentleman approve of that method of legislation?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; I do not. I do not approve of deficiency legislation except when absolutely necessary.

I think that Congress, when it can determine the facts, should appropriate every dollar that is necessary for the ensuing fiscal year, but here is a case where even the members in charge of the work, where even the members of the Vocational Board, are unable to give to Congress just how much they will need.

Mr. DENISON. Is it not a fact that in an emergency like war, or the conditions growing out of war, there are a great many activities as to which, as a matter of absolute necessity, under the circumstances there can be no accurate estimate made? For instance, like the Army or the Navy, or for this kind of a service.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DENISON. And under those conditions the practical way to meet them is by a deficiency.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct. My remarks as to want of information on the part of the Vocational Board are not intended as a criticism, because we all know that it is impossible for them now to say just how many disabled soldiers and sailors will apply for this training and will be entitled to it. Those are facts which must be developed as we go along. The point I was trying to make is this, that when this present sundry civil appropriation bill was reported to the House, the only estimate before the Committee on Appropriations was one for \$4,000,000, and when I refer to an estimate I refer to an estimate coming in the legal way, through the Secretary of the Treasury. As I said a moment ago, there was a letter addressed to the chairman of the committee which indicated they would need about two million and a half in addition to the sum carried in the bill, amending section 2 of the original act, which would make eight million and a half; and if that had been true then there could have been no injury done to this service by the passage of the sundry civil appropriation bill, which carried \$6,000,000. But a different state of facts was evidently presented to the President and also presented to the Committee on Appropriations last Sunday, showing that

they will need a great deal more than \$6,000,000. The fact of the matter is, from the statements made as to the number of men who are now in training, who have been accepted for training and who are expected to apply, I do not think the sum of \$12,000,000 will be anything like sufficient to carry on the work throughout the next fiscal year. I feel satisfied, however, that the sum of \$12,000,000 which is carried under this bill will be sufficient to carry them at least for six or eight months of the year, so that Congress will have ample opportunity at the next session to appropriate whatever is necessary. I do not believe there is a man on the floor of the House who would deny the disabled soldiers and sailors a single dollar that is necessary to provide them with the proper training under the law.

There may be some difference as to the limitation upon the question of salaries. There may be some who think there ought not to be any limitation and others who think that the salary limitation here is too liberal. This limitation authorizes the Vocational Board to spend, I think, something in the neighborhood of \$850,000 for salaries to persons who draw more than \$2,500 a year, and the lid is off, the sky is the roof, so far as the amount they may expend in salaries under \$2,500 is concerned.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Is it not \$941,000?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That was the amount estimated by the Federal Vocational Board, but I think the committee's limitation has reduced it by about \$94,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I find the following in the language of the proviso:

That no persons (except members of the Federal Board for Vocational Education) shall be paid by said board out of the appropriation contained in this or any other act at a rate of compensation exceeding \$2,500 per annum.

Was it the purpose of the committee in framing that proviso to restrict this limitation to the officials employed by the Federal Board for the Rehabilitation of Wounded Soldiers, or was it in the purview of the committee that this limitation should apply to salaries paid to the old existing Board of Vocational Training?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; the members of the board are especially excepted.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I mean the employees of that other board.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It was the purpose of the committee to limit any salary that may be paid in this service by the Federal Board to the sums set out in the amendment. The gentleman will recall that there are three or four employees, possibly, of the board now who are drawing salaries from two different sources. In my own judgment it is contrary to a provision of law carried in one of the naval appropriation bills, but I am informed that the Comptroller of the Treasury has passed on it and says that it is proper. Of course, to his decision we must bow, but the committee in recommending that provision to the House did so with the purpose of preventing any salaries being paid out of any other fund in order to supplement salaries set forth in this amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But the specific proposition I want to clarify is whether this is intended under the salary limitation to embrace the employees of the original Vocational Board?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It applies to all of the employees.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And is not limited to those employed by the board under the act for the rehabilitation of wounded soldiers.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Then it is new legislation restricting the salary basis of some men already on the roll of the Vocational Board?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that a former hearing developed that \$10,000 was being paid to one employee, \$5,000 from one fund and \$5,000 from another. The sundry civil bill which we passed fixed the maximum at \$7,500. The maximum salary under this amendment is \$6,000. That is in accordance with an understanding with the members of the Federal Vocational Board and was their own suggestion. They stated to the committee that they did not desire to pay anyone more than \$6,000 and not more than two persons at the rate of \$5,000.

Mr. MADDEN. The restriction intended by the limitation is to prevent some man who on the face of things is supposed to get \$5,000 from getting \$10,000?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. That is as it ought to be. A man ought not be permitted to be on more than one pay roll, and that is what this restriction means.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. I have just made an examination as to how far this limitation will reach. There are 22 men now in the service under the Smith-Hughes Act who will be cut out if this remains



in the bill. There are 15 regional directors under that bill who get \$3,500 each. There are 2 assistants here in Washington who get \$4,000. These numbers that are specified here are limited to the rehabilitation of soldiers' activities. If this and any other act remain, it is going to disorganize the work under the Smith-Hughes vocational bill, and I think there was no effort to do that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There is no effort to disorganize any service, I will say to the gentleman; but if the gentleman will read this amendment he will find a most liberal provision as to salaries, more liberal, I venture to say, than any other act that has ever been passed through the Congress, and liberal because of the tremendous organization that has been built up by the Federal Board for Vocational Education. As a matter of fact, the facts show that they now have an organization amounting to \$3,488,000 per annum, and your committee felt and believe Congress will feel that it ought to keep its hand upon some of these salaries and put in a limitation which seems ample enough under all the circumstances. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. I do not believe my friend would say \$3,500 for a regional director was too much. There are 15 of them throughout the whole United States, and the gentleman would not say that that was an exorbitant price to pay them, and this bill will cut them out—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; this bill does not, I submit to the gentleman, cut them out.

Mr. FESS. Yes, it does; this bill does cut them out.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This bill provides for 28 in excess of \$3,500 and not in excess of \$4,000 each—

Mr. FESS. They are all employed under the soldiers' rehabilitation act.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. But under this bill there are 28 in excess of \$3,500, 27 at \$3,500, which makes more than 50.

Mr. FESS. But it does not include the regional directors under the Smith-Hughes Act. That includes those employed under the soldiers' disability act. You are going to cut out those under the Smith-Hughes Act, and I do not think the committee wants to do that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say frankly to the gentleman that my own idea of this provision was to limit the amount of salaries, the number paid, and the amount that might be paid out of the funds provided in this bill and the act which passed the other day under the charge of the gentleman from Ohio, and not to affect any other service.

Mr. FESS. I agree with the gentleman on that; but you are going back to the Smith-Hughes Act of 1918, which will cripple the service, and I do not think the committee wants to do that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The committee certainly has no idea of crippling the service. I say to the gentleman this provides for salaries of persons receiving over \$2,500, about \$850,000 in round numbers, and then, as I said awhile ago, they have absolutely unlimited authority to employ just as many as they please under \$2,500.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Iowa begins speaking, I have something on my mind and I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. GOOD. I yield for a question.

Mr. MADDEN. I understood the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] to say that the salary roll that this board has accumulated amounts to about \$3,400,000 a year. Now, I would like to know how much money they spend—

Mr. GOOD. I will take that up. I will try to answer the gentleman before I have completed my statement, but I want to make a statement in a logical way.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will yield, I want to know the percentage of cost of management. If you are going to expend 25 per cent of all the money for salaries, there ought to be some restriction somewhere, I do not care whether it is for the soldiers or for anyone else. [Applause.]

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. GOOD. I yield for a question.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it not a fact that when the other bill was up from the Committee on Education that three motions were made on this side of the House to increase the monthly amount, two of which were unsuccessful and the third was successful, and that all three of those motions to increase the monthly allowance came from this side of the House? Is not that a fact?

Mr. GOOD. I have not given attention to that phase of the matter and do not recall, but if the gentleman was here and remembers what was done, I will take his statement for it. I want to say now at the outset I do not believe—

Mr. FOSTER. If the gentleman will pardon me in this connection—

Mr. GOOD. I do not yield further just now.

Mr. FOSTER. It was by a vote of 62 to 57.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the public will or should look with approval upon any attempt from any source, I do not care how high that source may be, to drag in the mire of party politics the rehabilitation of our soldiers. The rights of the injured soldier are too sacred and our obligation therein is too great to think this should be done. [Applause on the Republican side.] I say without fear of successful contradiction that if the sundry civil bill as passed by the House in the last Congress had become law, only \$2,000,000 would have been available to rehabilitate the soldiers who were so unfortunate as to be wounded in this Great War. This Congress has already appropriated \$6,000,000 for the service and we are appropriating \$6,000,000 by this bill, or \$12,000,000, as opposed to \$2,000,000 in the last Congress. Now, let us get down to the solid facts and see just what we are talking about with regard to the veto of this measure. Under the law there never was sent to Congress but one estimate for this service for this fiscal year, and that was \$4,000,000. Subsequently, from the Committee on Education, there came a bill amending section 2 of the act carrying \$6,000,000 of appropriations, and that bill passed and has become the law, and every dollar of it is available for rehabilitation services.

The director, Dr. Prosser, on the 6th day of June, 1919, addressed a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in which he said that if the bill, coming with a favorable report from the Committee on Education, carrying \$6,000,000, should be adopted, then the estimate which he had made in a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, increasing the regular estimate of \$4,000,000 to \$6,000,000, could be reduced by \$3,500,000, which would leave available \$8,500,000 for the service. And until the President vetoed this bill there was never an intimation from anyone that the service would cost more than \$8,500,000 for the next year.

The gentleman, Dr. Prosser, who has been referred to as a very able man by Dr. Fess, made the statement when this measure was before the committee before that the total cost for the entire service for rehabilitating every man in the United States was \$13,502,200, and that it would require for the fiscal year \$6,000,000, or until the 30th day of June, 1920. You will find his table on page 19 of the report in the last hearings. It is as follows:

Total cost of work to be done (estimated).	
19,000 men trained for 10 months each, at average cost of \$655	\$12,455,000
27,360 men to be placed in employment, at \$20 each	547,200
60,000 additional men yet to be surveyed, at cost of \$10 per man	600,000
Total cost of work from June 27, 1918	13,602,200

The Federal Board of Vocational Education is composed of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Commissioner of Education, Mr. Holden, Mr. McIntosh, and Mr. Munroe. I have no prejudice, and I am sure the other members of the subcommittee that heard the testimony both in this Congress and in the last Congress have no prejudice against any of these men or against the director, Dr. Prosser. The men were unknown to us. I never knew any of them, except the members of the Cabinet, and they have not appeared before the committee. But I say to you without regard to politics there was no division in the Committee on Appropriations, either in the last Congress or in this, with regard to the fact that there never was a body of men anywhere intrusted with a great work who seemed to know as little about the subject, who had as small a vision of the great work with which they were intrusted or were attempting to perform as this board to whom we have intrusted the rehabilitation of these boys who have been so unfortunate as to be wounded in this Great War. These boys that were wounded are entitled to rehabilitation under this act and have the tenderest sympathy of every Member of the House. [Applause.] And they should have the tenderest and deepest sympathy of every loyal and true American. And I believe they have. I have stated several times on the floor of the House that Congress would not and the country would not tolerate any cheeseparing with regard to this service. And if the President had signed this bill, and if the limitations were too rigid, if the money carried was found too little, he could have come before the committee or had some one else come before the committee, and within 48 hours he would have received a favorable report, lifting the limitation to the extent that the service would not be impaired. That has been the attitude of the Committee on Appropriations, every member of it, without regard to the political parties to which those members belong, so far as I know.

The President says in his message on this subject:

Inasmuch as there are already over 4,000 disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines in training, and inasmuch as another 4,000 will be put in training now that the amendment to section 2 has become a law, it is clear that even at the rate of only \$80 a month, a sum approximating \$8,000,000 will be required for the support of these men.

Who told the President that? Mr. Munroe says it is not true. Mr. Munroe says he did not tell it, and he does not know who did tell the President. Eight thousand men? Four thousand in training, and 4,000 ready for training. Mr. Munroe testified within three days of the date the President wrote that message that instead of 4,000 in training there were 5,200. Instead of 4,000 more waiting there were 8,250 waiting. The President says 8,000. The vice president of this organization says there are almost 14,000. The President says it will take \$8,000,000 to pay for the subsistence and tuition of these men. The vice president of the board, within two days after the President's message, says that it would take \$18,000,000 to pay this cost. And yet the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] rises here and says that he supports this message. I do not know where the President got the information, but Mr. Munroe denies its correctness.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. For a question.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman will recall, from the veto message of the President, that the \$8,000,000 will be used totally for subsistence?

Mr. GOOD. Of course, the gentleman is correct about that. That is what I have read.

Now, immediately after the passage of this law this man who has been so loudly praised by my very good friend, Dr. Fess, sent this message throughout the United States, for which I contend there is absolutely no warrant, and that it is at variance with the facts. His message was:

Under legislation just passed there must be drastic reduction of salaries unless, as we hope, some way can be found to prevent it. Therefore, withdraw immediately all forces from hospitals and other points of discharge and discontinue this service at once. Readjust your forces by releasing a number of men equal to the number so withdrawn. Retain the best qualified men. Inform all men remaining in the service who are receiving over \$2,500 that such excess can not be guaranteed after July 1. Urge all good men to stick by the disabled soldier to see if the matter can not be straightened out.

Notwithstanding that message, the bill that he referred to carried 52 places with salaries over \$2,500. Is it possible that a man violating the statutes of the United States that provide that no man shall receive two salaries, and this man so receiving two salaries, and is sending out such a false telegram, is the kind of a man to bring rehabilitation to those boys who were wounded in carrying the flag to glory? It ought not to be possible. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Munroe says that the cost per man was \$275. And my good friend—

Mr. MADDEN. Two hundred and seventy-five dollars for how long?

Mr. GOOD. For the complete training. Dr. Fess referred to that fact in his speech, I think, of February 24, in which he said:

The truth about the matter—

I am quoting now from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS]—

The truth about the matter is, and I want to call attention to it just a minute, that it costs \$275, according to the estimate, to rehabilitate a soldier. Think of it! Two hundred and seventy-five dollars in taking a wounded man and putting him on his feet and making him self-supporting and self-respecting, so that he does not become a charge on the Government, but can look the world in the face and not feel that he is a pensioner, a subject of charity; and yet we educate in universities and under private management students at a cost of \$1,000 to \$2,000.

Now, Dr. Fess is one of the very ablest men on the floor of this House. It takes an expert of the kind referred to, I take it, in the President's message, to fool Dr. Fess. But Mr. Munroe and Dr. Prosser completely fooled him. What are the facts? According to the testimony of these men last Sunday, it will take, not \$275, but for subsistence and tuition alone \$1,400 for each man.

Mr. MADDEN. Does that \$1,400 include the salary of the men that spend this money each year?

Mr. GOOD. It does not. That is for maintenance and tuition. I have a letter here as to the men who are now employed and placed on the pay roll at salaries of \$2,500 and over per annum, showing that they will draw out of the Federal Treasury this next year on the present basis of employment \$941,000.

Ah, but that is not all. Gentlemen talk about the rehabilitation. This message pleads more for the rehabilitation of the college professor than it does for the soldiers of the United States. [Applause.] Why, this letter just written this morning by the board says:

In response to your telephonic request, I take pleasure in advising you that the pay rolls for personal services of persons employed in the administration of vocational rehabilitation act during the month of June, 1919, amounted to \$291,719.80. This amount multiplied by 12 equals \$3,488,537.60.

Remember that this is not to pay for teachers or the salary of the men who will train these men. This is the salary of the chair warmers—the men for whose rehabilitation the message pleads. And yet, according to the testimony of Dr. Prosser, this

great expert, it was only going to require about \$13,000,000 for three years to pay all of the expenses of the rehabilitation of every soldier who will come under the provisions of that very splendid law.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. The \$13,000,000 was arrived at under the estimates of the old law, which permitted \$30 per month for subsistence, while the new law gives them \$80 a month, which is more than double.

Mr. GOOD. Well, the gentleman has not stated that exactly correct. The change was made from \$75 to \$80 a month, or an increase of \$5 per month, but there was, of course, an amount equal to \$35 a month transferred from the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and now part paid by the board.

Mr. FESS. Originally it was \$30 a month that the disabled soldier got as subsistence, but now we make it \$80, and that makes the difference.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. I will as soon as I shall have concluded. If the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] will make a computation, he will find that the changes will not foot anything like \$1,400. I want to give the House these facts, and then I will yield.

Mr. MADDEN. But these facts that I have are facts that the House ought to have.

Mr. GOOD. I will try to give the House the facts which I think it ought to have first. Then I will yield.

Mr. MADDEN. Then the House has no rights here.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; it has. But no one has the right to take a man off the floor. I do not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa refuses to yield.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Munroe, in making his statement to the committee, said that the Federal Board for Vocational Education never knew that there was a limitation as to salaries in this provision that was carried in the last bill. The bill that passed the House in February, carrying \$2,000,000, placed a limitation on the salaries that these people could receive, and that limitation was greater, and everybody in the House, irrespective of whether he was a Republican or a Democrat, voted for it. That limitation was greater than the limitation in the bill which the President vetoed, and yet Mr. Munroe and Mr. McIntosh came before the committee on Sunday last and said they never knew that limitation was in the bill.

Now, let us see whether they knew or not. On the 6th day of June Mr. Prosser addressed a letter to me as chairman of the committee, and in that letter he says:

The House Committee on Appropriations reported to the committee the whole lump appropriation of \$1,500,000 on motion of Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the appropriation, and this amount was raised in the Committee of the Whole to \$2,000,000, and included in an item in the sundry civil bill as it passed the House.

Why, Dr. Prosser knew who made the motion increasing the amount from \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000, and yet they came before us on Sunday last and said they did not know what was in the bill that they referred to in this letter, giving the amount that the bill carried and the name of the gentleman who made the motion. Mr. Munroe, who is vice chairman in charge of this matter, never made an estimate to Congress under the Secretary of the Treasury but for \$4,000,000 for this service for the next year. He wrote that letter saying that if the \$6,000,000 was granted in the educational bill all the additional amount that would be required was \$2,500,000, or \$8,500,000 in all. Then he withheld from Congress and the Committee on Appropriations all the information he had in regard to this service until last Sunday, when he came before the committee, and for the first time that human lips uttered the words, so far as I am advised, Mr. Munroe said it is going to take \$18,000,000 just to pay for the training and the tuition, and he thinks the total sum may amount to \$25,000,000. And no estimate even now for any additional amount.

Gentlemen, the estimate was made last October of \$4,000,000, when this country was at war, and every day the wires were flashing the news to various parts of the country, to the cities and to the hamlets and the towns, telling of some brave boy who was falling in battle; and it was at that time, when the list of wounded was growing day by day, that this great committee of experts said it would only cost \$4,000,000 for this year. And now, six months after the armistice was signed, they come in and think it may take \$25,000,000 for this service. But they do not know; that nobody knows. Now, it was on this showing that the committee reported out a bill carrying \$6,000,000 additional to the \$6,000,000 already appropriated, or \$12,000,000, which is ten millions more than was carried in the bill as it passed the House in the last Congress. It may not be enough, but if it is



not, all that will be necessary will be for the board to submit a new estimate and the money will be appropriated. There is absolutely no question about that. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk began the reading of the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the first reading of the bill was dispensed with under the rule. Was it not?

The CHAIRMAN. This is not the first reading of the bill. This is the reading of the bill for amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. I understand there is no amendment but the new matter. I ask unanimous consent that the second reading of the bill be dispensed with, except as to the new matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would entertain the proposition, but, unfortunately, the House has already ruled that the bill shall be read. This committee can not change that rule by unanimous consent.

Mr. MADDEN. When you get through with the paragraph, I would like recognition. Nobody knows when you finish a paragraph, because we have not a copy of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will request the Clerk to indicate when he reaches the end of the paragraph.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we are in committee now, and notwithstanding the rule, it seems to me it would be in order for the committee to rise, if it sees proper so to do, and the House, notwithstanding any rule by unanimous consent, could omit the reading of this bill, which will take two or three or four hours, and which is not subject to amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOOD. If the committee should rise, is it the ruling of the Chair that the House can not grant unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The ruling that the Chair made was that the committee could not change the order of the House.

Mr. GOOD. I move, Mr. Chairman, that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7343) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, except the provision on page 19 with respect to vocational rehabilitation, shall be considered as having been read, and that the further reading be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the bill, except the provision as to vocational rehabilitation, on page 19, be considered as having been read.

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. GOOD. I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 7343, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the sundry civil bill, H. R. 7343, with Mr. TOWNER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. I desire to be notified when we reach the end of a paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, namely:*

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire recognition.

Mr. GOOD. I make the point of order that under the rule no motion or amendment is in order except to the provision on page 19 relating to vocational education.

Mr. MADDEN. I insist on a reading of the rule to see whether that is true or not.

Mr. GOOD. I make the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. I insist on having the rule read, so that I may see whether the point of order is well taken.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order!

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. That has been done under the rule. This is the second reading.

The CHAIRMAN. The first reading of the bill has already been dispensed with.

Mr. GOOD. I ask for the regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask that the rule be read, to see whether the gentleman's point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair rules that the rule provides that no amendment is in order except an amendment to the particular section referred to in the rule, on page 19.

Mr. BUTLER. You can not even move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if that rule provides that you can not amend any part of this bill except one part—

Mr. BUTLER. It does that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the rest of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Missouri that the Chair has already ruled that that can not be done in Committee of the Whole, the House having ordered otherwise.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Will the Chair hear me on that?

Mr. MADDEN. I object, Mr. Chairman, if necessary, so that there need be no discussion about it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I just want to say this—

Mr. WALSH. The point of order has been made—the objection has been made.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. It does not make any difference if the objection has been made. I am arguing a point of order to the Chair, and the Chair has recognized me, and there is no force in this House that can take me off the floor under those circumstances.

Mr. WALSH. There is no point of order pending.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The point of order has been raised, and I asked to be heard on it, on the right to make a request for unanimous consent in committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman started to argue a point of order that the Chair had already decided, but the Chair has the right to recognize the gentleman, and the Chair has done so.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The Chair has that right absolutely, and nobody can take me off my feet on that except the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has the right to recognize the gentleman from Virginia, and has done so, on the point of order. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, what I wish to say in this connection is this: It is perfectly true that in Committee of the Whole we can not do anything by unanimous consent that would affect the procedure in the House, or usurp the power of the House by undertaking to give rights that are in excess of our authority, as for instance to give leave to extend remarks generally in the RECORD. The RECORD is not a committee publication. But with respect to proceedings in the Committee of the Whole, we may facilitate them by omitting by unanimous consent to do something that is not of the essence. Suppose we take such action. Who is there to gainsay us, and since we do not report the steps taken in the Committee of the Whole in detail, what evidence will there be when we return to the House of our unanimous consent proceeding? There is no rule of which I have any cognizance which undertakes to say that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole shall not put a request for unanimous consent, whatever it may be. There is no likelihood that mischief will result from action sought by unanimous consent, for the reason that one objection will reject the request. I have seen many things done in Committee of the Whole by unanimous consent which were contrary to the provisions of some House rule, but the public business was expedited by this action. At times action is taken in Committee of the Whole by unanimous consent, which at other times has been refused. For instance, I have seen the time for general debate which had been fixed in the House, extended by unanimous consent in Committee of the Whole. This request to dispense with this reading relates to us, to our authority, to our action, to our proceedings exclusively. To read this bill is pure formality that will accomplish nothing, save to waste our time. If by unanimous consent we omit that action, the validity of our report to the House and consequent disposition of the same, will be in no wise affected.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman contend, if the House adopts a rule for certain procedure in the consideration of a measure, that when the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole the committee can abrogate that rule by a request to dispense with the reading if objection is made?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Not if objection is made, certainly not. I am not contending for that proposition; but for the right on our part to facilitate our own proceedings in Committee of the Whole by unanimous consent. The time of general debate in the Committee of the Whole is primarily fixed in the House, but suppose after we get into Committee of the Whole, we agree amongst ourselves to debate generally for a longer period, how will that affect the validity of our ultimate action? What is the difference in substance between that action, and in beating the devil about the bush by taking up the bill under the five-minute rule and after reading a paragraph agree by unanimous consent that a Member shall proceed for an hour out of order? As I have stated I have seen general debate excluded by unanimous consent in the Committee of the Whole. Moreover I contend that that action was perfectly proper and parliamentary.

Do the Members of this body realize that most of our proceedings in the Committee of the Whole by unanimous consent are in contravention of some rule of the House, and there is no difference in authority and effect between a special rule for action on a given measure, and the general rules under which we may consider another bill. If by unanimous consent we can waive, or dispense with formal procedure imposed by the general rules upon proceedings in Committee of the Whole, we can dispense by like unanimity with provisions of the same character in a special rule under which we may chance to be operating. This it seems to me, must be a patent and unescapable conclusion.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman realizes that this is a pretty important bill, and I think the gentleman will agree that anything of the kind ought not to be done in the committee, but that we should go into the House to do it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. If the thing proposed to be done jeopardized in anywise this bill I would not suggest this action. Further if request was made for any action that would in any conceivable degree imperil the future of this measure, I would be the first to object to it, but I defy anyone to point out how, or in what way, if we dispense with the reading of this measure by unanimous consent, that fact will ever appear in the House when we report this bill with our conclusions. The bill would be taken up in the House for action on the report of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and disposed of in order. The regularity of that disposition would not be affected by the fact that we had saved several very precious hours for more important work than remaining in session for a reading to which no one would give the slightest attention.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Where the Committee of the Whole is required to perform a certain act, is it not within the power of the committee, by unanimous consent, to dispense with that act?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. There is no question about that.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. The Committee of the Whole, under the rule, must have the bill read, but it seems proper, by unanimous consent, to dispense with the reading.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes; and it is the same as read when, by unanimous consent, it is agreed to dispense with the reading.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee can within certain limits control its own action, but the committee must act under the direction of the House when the House has directed the committee so to act. It is not within the power of the committee to vary it. The rule adopted provides that at the conclusion of general debate the bill shall be read. That is the rule for the committee to act upon, and there is no possibility of the committee changing that rule. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

#### FEDERAL BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

Vocational rehabilitation: For an additional amount for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, as amended, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding to be done at the Government Printing Office, law books, books of reference, and periodicals, \$6,000,000, of which sum not exceeding

\$15,000 may be expended for rent of quarters in the District of Columbia if space is not provided in Government-owned buildings by the Public Buildings Commission: *Provided*, That no person (except the members of the Federal Board for Vocational Education) shall be paid by said board out of the appropriation contained in this or any other act at a rate of compensation exceeding \$2,500 per annum and rates above that sum, except not to exceed the following: One at \$6,000, 2 at \$5,000 each, 28 in excess of \$3,500 and not in excess of \$4,000 each, 27 at \$3,500 each, 70 at \$3,000 each, 60 at \$2,750 each, and 100 at \$2,500 each.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the sum of \$6,000,000 and inserting \$8,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MADDEN: Strike out the sum of \$6,000,000 and insert \$8,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, according to the statement made by the gentleman from Iowa, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, it seems that it will take anywhere from \$18,000,000 to \$25,000,000 to do the work of rehabilitating the wounded soldiers. And while he says that no estimate for more than \$4,000,000 was ever made in the regular way, in addition to that provided for in the act reported from the Committee on Education, yet he says that beyond any doubt it will take at least \$18,000,000. The proposal is to appropriate \$6,000,000, and that is in addition to the amount appropriated under the vocational act, which will make a total of \$12,000,000.

The President of the United States said in his veto message of this measure that not less than \$8,000,000 would be needed to meet the emergency that is now before us. I am for rehabilitating the soldier at whatever cost, and I am not for making the appropriation by piecemeal on the theory that we can meet the emergency in deficiency bills at some future time. I am in favor of appropriating money to meet the need now and not some other time. This is the time, and this is the hour, and there can be no excuse for reporting a bill with the same amount that has been rejected through the veto of the President. If it takes \$18,000,000, or mayhap \$25,000,000, to meet the needs of these men who come before us and say that \$12,000,000 is enough, let us appropriate that sum.

Complaint is made by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that those in charge of the rehabilitation of these soldiers have been unable to say how many men would need rehabilitation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Not now, thank you. We must all realize that no man living can tell how many men will need it until the war is over. No man living can tell how many of the wounded men would need rehabilitation until they have served a period of treatment in the hospitals in this country and in France. And as time goes by it will undoubtedly be proved beyond any question that more of these men will need that treatment, need the education, need the rehabilitation, for many of them are not going to be cured of what might in the beginning seem to be but a very slight wound.

And so I say that we have an obligation, a greater obligation than was ever imposed upon a legislative body in all the world, and that obligation is to see beyond question that whatever funds may be needed are supplied for the rehabilitation of these men.

They are unable to make a living for themselves; otherwise vocational education would not have been provided, and no man is permitted to enter this vocational educational institution except the men who must be reconstructed. And shall we say that a million or two million dollars is to stand in the way of reconstruction of men who gave their all for the flag, who buckled on their armor and went forth where battles raged to offer for the Nation's life the lifeblood of their hearts? Are we to say that the appropriation bill must carry six and not eight million dollars? Shall we stand upon the order of the amount? We have already expended \$51,500,000,000 for the war, and we have left 112,500 American boys buried on the fields of France, and I say the time has come when America, through its Congress, must speak, and now is the time to increase the appropriation. [Applause.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]:

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BUCHANAN offers the following substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. MADDEN:

Amend the bill by striking out the figures "\$6,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$12,000,000," and add at the end of the provision after the word "each" the following provision, to wit: "And provided further, That not more than 18 per cent of all appropriations made by Congress on this subject shall be used for the payment of salaries."



Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I have been sitting here and listening to Members discuss this subject, and everyone, without exception, has expressed unlimited sympathy with, and a perfect willingness to aid, those who have met with misfortunes in the war. I thought possibly this amendment would give them the opportunity to demonstrate whether or not they meant what they said, and extend to all who were injured in the war an opportunity to reap the benefits of the rehabilitation act and not have it limited to a few. Let me state a few facts from the hearings, and if any man believing these facts can escape from the conclusion that it will take \$18,000,000 or more, then I do not know what mathematics mean.

Mr. Munroe says, in round numbers, there are 14,000 men in training in this service now. It takes \$80 per month under the compensation law for each unmarried man, \$115 for a man with a wife, and \$125 for a man with a wife and one child, and so on up, according to the number of children he has, as provided by the compensation act. This makes an average of \$1,200 per year for each man in training. It takes \$200 a year for tuition for each man, which makes the amount \$1,400 a year per man for compensation and tuition alone. Multiply \$1,400 a year by 14,000 and you have over \$19,000,000. Escape it if you can. If you want to provide for these boys, you ought to appropriate the necessary money to accommodate all who apply. Be men and meet the issue; be not penny wise and pound foolish when making appropriations to be used for the benefit of those who on foreign fields upheld our flag so bravely and so gloriously.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. If I understand the reading of the gentleman's amendment, he provides for \$12,000,000?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Twelve million dollars in this bill, and that, in addition to the \$6,000,000 appropriated the other day for this purpose in the vocational education act, making a total of \$18,000,000.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would permit, I wish he would tell us how he fixed the percentage of salary.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The way I fixed the percentage to be expended in salaries and the reason I did it is to keep the organization, if it be so inclined, from spending in the payment of salaried officers the appropriation we make for the benefit of the soldiers.

Under the bill as reported by the committee the board in control of the rehabilitation activities have unlimited power to employ an unlimited number of civilian employees at salaries between twenty-five and twenty-six hundred dollars each per year. I do not say that this board will abuse this discretion, but believe it the duty of Congress to throw sufficient safeguards around this appropriation to guarantee that the money we appropriate will be applied to the rehabilitation of the soldiers and not squandered in the payment of salaries to numberless civilian employees throughout the country.

Mr. KINCHELOE. But how does the gentleman arrive at the 18 per cent?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I based it on the present salary basis of the board, and found that 18 per cent of the \$18,000,000 will give \$3,240,000 for salaries, which is, I believe, about the amount they are now paying in salaries, and I feel that more than one-sixth of an appropriation of this size ought to be sufficient for salaries of employees to conduct and supervise the operation of this institution.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. DONOVAN. Does not that include operating expenses, office, and all that—general expenses?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No; it includes only salaries.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the gentleman appropriates \$18,000,000 altogether and then shows that it is necessary to expend \$3,000,000 and odd for salaries, he will be \$3,000,000 short.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Certainly, but I figure that in this way: It usually takes about 10 months to train a soldier. That leaves \$200 per year to spare for each soldier. In other words, the \$1,400 is calculated for the full 12 months. It would take about 10 months on an average to train a soldier, which would leave \$200 per soldier to make up for extra expenses.

Mr. ANDERSON. Eighteen million dollars was figured on a 12-months' basis?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes; but it does not take 12 months. It takes 10 months, although some may take more. I submit that proposition to the House, and I say that we should meet the issue and that we should not be penny wise and pound foolish. We should not be parsimonious with these soldiers; we should not run any chance of excluding even one single man whom it is

necessary to rehabilitate. It is the most sacred and the highest duty of this Government, as far as the resources of the Government will permit, to restore the impaired ability to earn a livelihood to each of our soldier boys who were injured in this war. Those boys who responded to their country's call, offered their lives for their country's sake, fearlessly invaded the gas-poisoned forests, held trenches against overwhelming odds, went over the top, and carried the tide of battle against the Hun at the point of the bayonet, and in so doing received serious wounds and material injury, which impaired their ability to earn a living. It is the duty of this Government to restore that impaired ability as far as it is humanly possible to do so, and any Member of Congress who fails to cheerfully respond to a generous discharge of this duty disgraces his high office and should be scourged from the House with a whip of scorpion tails.

But reverting again to the facts. There are 14,000 men whose applications have been approved for the rehabilitation training, and it will take over \$19,000,000 for maintenance and tuition alone to train these men. This makes no provision for medical attention, for car fare, and for administration work. This makes no provision for the thousands of other wounded soldiers who are daily applying for this training or no provision even for the examination and survey of other applicants who have been wounded and are seeking to be benefited by this law. There is an average of 150 wounded soldiers per day applying for this training, and this appropriation makes no provision for them.

If we mean what we profess and perform our duty to these boys who so gallantly and courageously served their country, we must act now and restore their impaired ability as far as it is within our power to do so, that life to them may be less burdensome and more pleasant. This is an undertaking that can not be postponed, and the statement that we can take care of them in a deficiency appropriation bill is misleading and hypocritical, as every Member of this House knows that the appropriation we make now will limit and confine the work and result in the exclusion of many wounded soldiers from the benefits of the rehabilitation act.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's idea is about right, and I am going to vote for his amendment, but does he think there is any danger of the President's vetoing it because we make it too much?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think not. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the President in his veto message said it would take \$8,000,000 alone for subsistence of only 8,000. Our figures show there are 14,000, and that they are coming in at the rate of 150 a day. Therefore, if anything, the appropriation is too small even if my amendment is adopted. I do not think the President will veto it, but I do think the President was right in vetoing the bill because this appropriation was too small. Instead of being criticized by Republicans in the House, he should be commended. He of all men realizes the duty of this Government to take care of the wounded boys, and he of all men will see that this Government does its duty toward these boys. If Congress does not make an adequate appropriation to take care of these wounded soldiers, I sincerely hope the President will veto the bill again.

Ah, gentlemen, if you will talk with some of these wounded soldiers who have come back, you will find that they went through hell itself for our country and its cause. If, therefore, they went through hell for us, we ought to be willing to go to hell for them. It is true, by their heroic action and victory they have "inscribed their lofty name a light, a landmark on the cliffs of fame," but they can not live on fame alone. We must therefore make adequate provision for their rehabilitation, as far as possible, and compensate them for their impaired abilities, to the end that no American soldier who was injured in this war shall ever feel humiliated, become a beggar on the streets, or become an inmate of a charitable institution. Unless adequate provision is made for them, I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Is it proper under the rules to amend this bill to increase the amount to be allowed for each individual's education?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not think there is any question about that. I think so.

Mr. DENISON. I think it ought to be a little bit more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I call the attention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] to the fact that Mr. Munroe, the same man who made the statement the gentleman has quoted, on page 72, and Mr. McIntosh, also, states that it would cost approximately \$25,000,000

for the year, and Mr. Munroe said he thought probably that would not be enough. Of course, Mr. Munroe said he did not know anything about it.

Now, I think we ought to act upon this matter in a big way and in a way that will reflect credit upon the Members of this House. I do not believe there has ever been a time since this law was enacted when anybody wanted to deprive a single soldier of this rehabilitation service. Every Member of the House wants to grant every dollar necessary, but after all we must be careful in making these appropriations that we do not invite waste and extravagance all along the line. It is not alone in the payment of salaries that waste will take place. Now, in regard to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. The gentleman says that the President asks for \$8,000,000, or rather stated in his message it would require \$8,000,000, and therefore he makes his amendment in that amount. Now, I call his attention to the fact there has been appropriated and is already available under the bill which passed the House and Senate and has been signed by the President, amending section 2 of the act, \$6,000,000 for this service. This bill carries \$6,000,000 for this service; the two bills carry, therefore, \$12,000,000. I do not know whether that will be sufficient or not. No man living knows whether it will be sufficient or not. Mr. Munroe, vice president of the board, when he was before the committee on Sunday, when he was asked the following questions by Mr. MAGEE, said:

Mr. MAGEE. The probability is that the average would not exceed 10,000. Do I understand you estimate the number at 20,000?

Mr. MUNROE. It may be 20,000. I do not know.

Mr. MAGEE. You do not know anything about it?

Mr. MUNROE. Nobody can foretell it; nobody knows.

Now, with this service in its infancy, with the desire on the part of Congress to give every dollar that is necessary, I ask the House to be sane and calm and to do that which is the businesslike thing to do; and if at any time there appears that the \$12,000,000 will not be sufficient it will take only 48 hours after the estimate has been made to the committee to report out a bill granting all that is required to supply the deficiency. I submit that is the orderly way to proceed—that is the way the business men of the country would have this Congress to proceed; it is the way these soldiers would have us proceed—and not proceed without any estimate before us except the wild statement of what it may cost. If you went on that kind of an estimate, if that side of the House wants to appropriate \$12,000,000, they ought to take the responsibility; but I believe this side of the House—that stands for economy, that stands for the elimination of waste [applause]—should say that, even when it comes to appropriating for the soldier, we propose to appropriate the money in a businesslike way—appropriate all that is necessary, but not millions upon millions upon the statement of a man who says, "I do not know how much it will take; no one knows." [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, may I have the attention of the membership for just a moment to see whether we have not some confusion here? The bill as passed from the Committee on Education carried \$6,000,000. The sundry civil appropriation bill provided \$6,000,000 in lieu of that \$6,000,000. That would have left \$6,000,000 for the administration of this work this year. The President asked for \$2,000,000 additional, which would have made \$8,000,000. The law providing \$6,000,000 is signed and the money is provided. This asks \$6,000,000 more, which is \$12,000,000, which is \$4,000,000 more than the President asks for, and if I am incorrect I should like to be corrected. That is my understanding after looking into it carefully. We are giving \$4,000,000 more than the President asked for in his message.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will yield to my friend.

Mr. MADDEN. Who said that?

Mr. FESS. I say it in view—

Mr. MADDEN. Does anybody verify it? [Laughter.]

Mr. FESS. I think I can verify it.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not mean to insinuate—

Mr. FESS. I understand the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think the Committee on Appropriations will attempt to verify it.

Mr. GOOD. That is exactly a correct statement. The gentleman has stated the case correctly. The bill from the Committee on Education which passed carried \$6,000,000. If this bill passes in the form it is reported, it will carry \$6,000,000, or \$12,000,000 in all will be available.

Mr. FESS. In my time let me ask the chairman that if the bill as reported from his committee had been adopted and had become the law we would have had only \$6,000,000 for this service?

Mr. GOOD. That is correct.

Mr. FESS. Now we will have \$12,000,000. That means \$4,000,000 more than the President asked in his veto message, and that is the reason I am willing to support the matter which is before us.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If the gentleman will permit, is it not a fact that the President in his veto message referred to \$8,000,000 as covering only subsistence and did not therefore take into consideration the \$8,000,000 as covering tuition, travel allowance, medical staff, or administration or anything else?

Mr. FESS. If we had passed the bill under the instructions of the President we would have had \$8,000,000. As it is we are having \$12,000,000.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The President said \$8,000,000 would be needed for subsistence for 4,000 men. We are now presented with an entirely different statement for which we are appropriating not only for subsistence, for tuition, traveling allowance, and so forth, but for a larger number of men.

Mr. FESS. That is true. The fact still remains we are giving the soldiers \$4,000,000 more than the President asked for, and it seems to me it is a justifiable reason for passing it.

Mr. MADDEN. But not anything like we ought to appropriate.

Mr. FESS. That might be, but we can easily increase it when demanded.

Mr. DONOVAN. Assuming that to be a fact, of which I have some doubt, and from the gentleman's point of view possibly it is, is it not a fact that the problem which now confronts this board is that it will take a greater amount than \$12,000,000?

Mr. FESS. It probably will take more. I think that would be sufficiently cared for under a deficiency bill. But what I am trying to correct is the statement that this bill is not meeting the requirements of the veto message. It goes away beyond the requirement.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to my friend from Kentucky.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Does not the President in his message say that this \$8,000,000 would only cover under the estimate what the instructors would draw in salary, and says specifically that there will be nothing left for the tuition?

Mr. FESS. Unless you gave the \$8,000,000 instead of the \$6,000,000.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Did he not say in his message that the \$8,000,000 would only pay for tuition and would leave nothing for the operation?

Mr. FESS. I still insist that the bill is going further than the President's suggestion in his veto message.

Mr. GOOD. The concluding paragraph of the President's message contains the following:

I therefore return the bill with the hope that the Congress will reconsider this section of the law, restore the \$6,000,000 appropriated under the act amending section 2, and most liberally revise the salary limitations, so that this beneficent work may go on, and go on at once.

And we went even further than that.

Mr. FESS. That would leave \$4,000,000 less than we now are granting. I speak in the most thorough sympathy with the efforts for rehabilitation, as every Member knows, and if the \$12,000,000 is not enough I shall be one of the first men to urge the committee to vote more. However, it seems to me that this is a very generous allotment from the standpoint of what heretofore was considered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. GOOD. I want to see if we can not agree as to the time on this amendment and amendments thereto. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and all amendments thereto, as well as all other amendments as to the amount, be limited to 45 minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does that include the prohibition of offering an amendment to strike out the words "or any other act," as contained in the proviso?

Mr. GOOD. That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. DONOVAN. Reserving the right to object, was I included in the schedule of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD]?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. DONOVAN. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and amendments



thereto, and all amendments fixing the amount contained in the paragraph, shall be limited to 45 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

Mr. GOOD. Then I move that all debate on that portion of the bill be limited to 45 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goop] moves that all debate on this amendment and amendments thereto, and all amendments fixing the amount contained in the paragraph, be limited to 45 minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. QUIN. I thank the Chair.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] offered a substitute which I rise to support, and shall give my reasons for it. It is apparent from the hearings that it will take at least \$18,000,000. Understand me, I realize that every man on this floor, Democrat and Republican, has voted and will continue to vote to give the wounded soldiers every dollar that they may be entitled to. And all this political talk I do not take any stock in. [Applause.] We are all patriots here. The hearings show that \$4,000,000 was the proper amount at the time it was appropriated. The hearings show that \$6,000,000 was the sum needed when we came forward with the next appropriation, and the later hearings now show, since the veto, that it will require at least \$18,000,000. We understand that it will even take more than that. It is indicated in these hearings that there may be 98,000 of these wounded men. True, Congress can appropriate the money as the occasion arises. There is no intention on the part of any man on either side of this House to curtail that board and its activities. But there is one thing that I shall stand for, and that is a limitation on the salaries of these school-teachers and professors who are in charge of that work. I stand ready to vote every dollar that is necessary to properly teach these men and in order to take care of them and sustain them and pay their traveling expenses, but I believe that the American Congress should not allow salaries of \$10,000 and \$15,000 and \$20,000 a year to be given in the name of patriotism to some \$2,500 man to rehabilitate these soldiers and return them to practical life; and I shall vote accordingly, because I believe it is up to this Congress to in some way curtail the wild and extravagant expense that every man can see is going on in this country. [Applause.]

We are here to take care of the soldiers who fought for our country, and we should be here, and I am here, to prevent profiteers demanding enormous salaries as teachers for supposed patriotism, reaching down in the pockets of the taxpayers of this country in the name of the soldier. [Applause.] If we do not curtail the salaries that will be paid for these instructors, you will see them flocking from every quarter of this Republic to get to be instructors of these poor wounded soldiers. [Applause.]

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. These men can be taught the necessary things to rehabilitate them and fix them for practical life by practical men on reasonable salaries. And when this Congress agrees that the salaries shall be \$5,000, \$6,000, and \$2,500, it seems to me that we ought to stand pat and say that we have some common sense and know what a man's services are worth when engaging in such business.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. QUIN. I can not yield. I have only a short time.

The salaries of the Army officers are fixed by Congress; the salaries of all Government officials are fixed by Congress. Why should not this Congress fix the limitation on the men who are to instruct these soldiers? We fix the amount that one of these wounded soldiers is to receive for compensation and to support and maintain him. I desire to see the wounded soldiers get all the benefit of this appropriation, instead of a large part of it being wasted in extravagant salaries for those in charge of the vocational training.

Why not fix the salaries of the men who shall be charged with the responsibility of instructing them? It is the duty of the representatives of the people to stand for the protection and the safeguarding of the taxpayers of this country at the same time that we are upholding the rights of the soldiers and endeavoring to give them that to which they are entitled under every phase of the circumstances and conditions which now surround them. If we are to legislate in the light of past events, we must realize that before we get through with the wounded soldiers our bills are to go up to \$100,000,000 for this splendid purpose instead of \$18,000,000. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. The Chair will recognize next the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON.]

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I take it that all of the members of the Committee on Appropriations and all of the Members of the House realize the desire of the country for economy in expenditures, and I take it that we all realize also that while that is the desire of the country it is likewise the desire that such economy shall not be secured under any circumstances at the expense of the soldier, and particularly at the expense of those soldiers who by reason of their services and their disabilities require education and rehabilitation. So the question before us is not one involving a difference of feeling as to the treatment to be given those men, but as to the adoption of the method best calculated to secure to those soldiers and sailors in the fullest degree and most effective manner the assistance which they have earned.

Now, there are those of us who from contact with the Vocational Education Board and the study of the hearings have come to fear that the disgrace and the scandal which have come upon the administration of our relations with the soldiers and their families in connection with the War Risk Insurance Bureau, which during the war by inefficiency of management in thousands of cases denied to the dependents of the boys and withheld from them the money and the aid which Congress voted them, will be repeated in connection with this Vocational Education Board. And that regardless of the amount of money you place in the hands of that board, the only way to secure desired results with the present constitution of that board is for Congress to keep as firm a grip as possible on the situation. In other words, instead of giving unlimited amounts of money to them blindly, simply because one member of that irresponsible board gets up and gives a wild guess—instead of giving them unlimited lumps of money on that ground we should give them the money we are satisfied they must have, and then later on, when the situation develops more clearly and the need is well established, if more is needed give it to them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that board has never yet been able to tell the Committee on Appropriations definitely and tangibly how much they want. More than that, that board does not know to-day what it is doing. They can not tell you to-day what they did yesterday. They can not tell to-day where their offices were yesterday, or where they are to-day.

The city of Detroit is a large city. You might think that a board intrusted with unlimited funds of Government money would be able to tell whether they had in the city of Detroit an office in operation or not; but they appear not to. At any rate, they give out the most contradictory and conflicting statements.

I have here a letter stating that a Michigan soldier, wounded at Chateau-Thierry July 20, 1918, who went to Detroit July 9 to arrange to secure the benefits of vocational training and on arrival there was met with the information that the Detroit office of the board had been closed and that to secure the attention necessary for his enrollment he would have to go to Chicago. That experience being called to the attention of the board in this city the board, through its superintendent of advisement and training, Mr. W. I. Hamilton, wrote a letter to the brother of the soldier acknowledging, in effect, the closing of the Detroit office, saying in substance "the office is closed and you will have to go to Chicago, but we will pay the money to send you to Chicago." That letter was written from the general offices here by a high officer, and a high salaried officer, July 12.

And yet Dr. Prosser, the director of this board, on July 10, one day after the wounded soldier found the office doors barred against him in Detroit, and two days before Mr. Hamilton's letter giving reasons blaming Congress for the closing, gave direct, positive assurance to my colleague, Mr. NICHOLS, who had vigorously brought the matter to his attention, positive assurance that the Detroit office of the board would not be closed. He furthermore on that occasion informed my colleague "that there never has been any intention to close the office and no orders have been sent to close it." To make assurance doubly sure, I am advised, Dr. Prosser called the Chicago office of the board, the district office, by telephone and was informed by the officer in charge there that no such orders had been sent to Detroit from Chicago.

In other words, the office which the wounded soldier found closed on July 9 and was July 12 declared by Mr. Hamilton, superintendent of advisement and training, to have been closed because of the action of Congress, that same office, it was July 10 declared by the director and by the district vocational officer to be then open, never to have been closed, and not intended to be closed.

Such diametrically opposing announcements convict the board of either gross incapacity with resulting confusion in their work or of deliberate insincerity, manifested in deceiving the country to the intended prejudice of Congress. In either case,



from such a board, from such management, the interests of the soldiers must suffer. Flinging millions into their care means extravagance and waste. We must act through the agency the administration has named, but we need not follow their ill-considered guesses not supported by proper showing. Every dollar for which proper expenditure can be shown should and will be voted. But to double and quadruple in appropriation any request made, either to us or to the President, is reckless, dangerous, and unnecessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE].

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I think it is a very unfortunate matter that such an important subject should be discussed in Congress with nothing injected into it but politics. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] talks about the scandal in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and the scandal in other things, and investigations on this and that subject—matters which have no relation whatever to the question of the rehabilitation of these crippled soldiers. If the gentleman and his party keep on investigating and spending money as they have started in their administration of the affairs of this House, the paramount issue in the next Congress will be the investigation of the expenditures of their investigating committees.

The purpose for which I rose mainly was to correct the impression that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] made as to the interpretation of the President's veto of this bill. He said in his statement that the President only asked for \$8,000,000. I want for the benefit of the House to read exactly what the President did say in regard to this appropriation, in the Record of July 12, in the first column on page 2493. He said:

The section of the bill which I now return, which governs the appropriation for this work, provides the sum of \$6,000,000 for all the expenses of rehabilitation, including the support of the disabled men in training, and this sum is stated to be "in lieu of the appropriation contained in the act approved July —, 1919, amending section 2 of the act approved June 27, 1918." Inasmuch as there are already over 4,000 disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines in training, and inasmuch as another 4,000 will be put into training now that the amendment to section 2 has become law, it is clear that even at the rate of only \$80 a month a sum approximating \$8,000,000 will be required for the mere support of these men, and that under the present appropriation nothing will be available for their tuition and travel or for placing them where they can earn a living, and it will be impossible to meet the needs of the new thousands who are every week seeking the benefits of the rehabilitation act.

Instead of asking for only \$8,000,000, he is stating affirmatively that \$8,000,000 will cover only the amount that they allowed, basing it upon \$80 a month, for their support. If there is any duty that we owe to those who risked their lives to serve their country, and who came out of the service wounded and maimed, it is to rehabilitate them as much as human brains and human genius can do it. We ought to have the best rehabilitation hospitals of any country in the world, and to give these unfortunate men the benefits of all the brains and all the training and all the advantages that money can buy; and, so far as I am concerned, I am opposed to giving it to them in piecemeals, a few million dollars to-day and a few million dollars more to-morrow. [Applause.] In other words, I am opposed to compelling this Bureau of Vocational Education to come back here every few months begging Congress to appropriate a few million dollars more. The statements of the people in charge of this bureau, who ought to know, are that it is going to cost at least from \$18,000,000 to \$25,000,000. If these soldiers are to be rehabilitated they ought to be rehabilitated now, and they ought not to have to wait, and the machinery of this work ought not to be paralyzed on account of insufficient appropriations while they come back here and ask for additional money. The amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] provides for \$12,000,000 more in addition to the \$6,000,000 already appropriated in the bill from the Committee on Education here a week or two ago, which makes \$18,000,000. When these gentlemen who have charge of it say that it will take at least \$18,000,000, if we are going to give it to them, why not give it to them now and let the soldiers receive the benefit of it? Because the evidence shows

that these men are coming forward and taking advantage of this opportunity by the thousands, and there is no more worthy, eleemosynary institution in the world than this rehabilitation service and these hospitals for these maimed and disabled soldiers, and we ought to adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Texas and not make piecemeal of it.

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say to the Members of the House that as a member of the subcommittee that made the recommendation to the full Committee on Appropriations, which was adopted by the full committee this morning, I attended the extensive hearing given to those representing the Federal Board of Vocational Education. We gave them what in our judgment will be a liberal amount at least for the balance of this year.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Can the gentleman say that the committee have given them all that it will cost for this fiscal year?

Mr. MAGEE. I will say to the gentleman that nobody can tell that, but refer the gentleman to page 24 of the hearings—

Mr. MADDEN. Is the gentleman willing to admit that there are 14,000 of these men who are now ready for training?

Mr. MAGEE. There are 5,200 now in training, according to the hearings.

Mr. MADDEN. And how many are there waiting?

Mr. MAGEE. As I recall there are some seven or eight thousand more waiting.

Mr. MADDEN. Waiting?

Mr. MAGEE. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. And it will cost \$1,400 per year per man, will it not?

Mr. MAGEE. Nobody can tell what it will cost.

Mr. MADDEN. So that it will cost \$18,000,000 or \$20,000,000 anyway?

Mr. MAGEE. I will call the attention of the gentleman to page 24 of the hearings.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE. I can not yield. I am referring to the statements in the hearings.

Mr. CALDWELL. I desire to call the gentleman's attention to something that is not in the hearings.

Mr. MAGEE. This is what Mr. Holder says:

Mr. HOLDER. We are going through the same experience as an insurance company or a growing concern, and we have not been in business long enough to quote from experience, so that it is impossible to answer your question positively, as much as we would like to do so.

Mr. MAGEE. That is what I thought. What I had in mind was this: In the first place, that you must be supplied with moneys to meet all reasonable needs. Everybody concedes that. Now then, if an appropriation should be made that is not sufficient for the purpose, Congress at any time, I am sure, would willingly respond and give you additional moneys. It seems to me we ought to try to work together, and work together along those lines. I do not like the intimation being thrown out that the Members of Congress are not willing to vote to give all the moneys that are reasonably necessary or all the moneys that may be required to fulfill these purposes. I do not like that. It seems to me no spirit of that sort should exist, and any talk or intimation of that sort is the cheapest kind of claptrap, political claptrap, you might call it. I do not like that, and I do not think it is warranted. I think we ought to get down to some reasonable basis, if we can, with the understanding that the men who are carrying on this great work will get all the moneys they will require for the purpose. That is my judgment about it.

Now, if you will turn to page 73 of the hearings you will find there further suggestions along this line.

Mr. MAGEE. You do not know anything about it?

Mr. MUNNOR. Nobody can foretell it; nobody knows.

Mr. MAGEE. It is a matter of guesswork?

Mr. MUNNOR. Absolutely.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MAGEE. I will yield for a question.

Mr. CALDWELL. Does the gentleman know how many men there are in hospitals who have not made application yet for the rehabilitation training?

Mr. MAGEE. The number is estimated in the hearings.

Mr. CALDWELL. I will tell the gentleman. It is between 50,000 and 100,000.

Mr. MAGEE. We should not appropriate any greater amount of money than is reasonably necessary to enable the Federal Board for Vocational Education to carry on this work. I think it will be apparent to any Member of the House who reads these hearings that we ought to retain some control of these salaries and put some limitation upon them. [Applause.]

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy of the Chair and of the committee in granting me time when I have already spoken once.

As I stated earlier to-day, the problem which confronts us here is a definite, ascertainable problem, and it has its solution. There are gentlemen here who embark in oratory and flights of fancy and who waive us aside, but the fact is that



there are a definite number of men now in training and ready for training. There are 13,757 men, or substantially 14,000 men. Last month there were submitted for training 150 men a day. This month, in July, there have been approved for training 76 men a day. The Committee on Appropriations say that the right amount can not be definitely arrived at by computation. Now, gentlemen criticize the Board for Vocational Training. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cramton] said—I do not know what the adjective was he used, but it was not complimentary, it was undeserved and unfair; but do these men on the Appropriations Committee, does the chairman with his vast knowledge of minute and infinitesimal things pertaining to the departments in the Government—does the gentleman know how much this is to cost? He does not pretend to make a prophecy. Where are you going to get the tangible figures to approximate, if you want to be generous and fair? You are going to the Vocational Board for the estimate. In the next six months, from indications now available, there will be 14,136 men plus 13,000 men now in training. It is simply a matter of mathematical computation—multiply 14,136 by \$1,400 a year for training and subsistence and you have the answer. This country last year paid \$222,000,000 for pensions. You know that this will alleviate and reduce pensions relative to the World War.

Another point overlooked by the Appropriations Committee is that they gave to the War Risk Insurance Bureau an appropriation of \$8,800,000 for the support of these same men. Now, this is nothing but a marshaling of funds from the War Risk Insurance under section 2 and placing it with the Vocational Board for Education and Training. Do not lose sight of that fact, and if you do adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Texas, for \$12,000,000 in addition to the \$6,000,000, you are then only giving a part of what is actually needed to successfully carry on the great work.

Are you going to give these needed funds in piecemeal? When the Appropriations Committee recommends \$6,000,000 do they do it out of any generosity of the heart? Why did they send for the board to get an estimate if they could get any better sort of one? Why bother with this tyrannical incompetent board of vocational educators? Why did the committee send for them? They took advantage of the board's requirement as stated, and they lopped off \$2,000,000 from the \$6,000,000 requested. Do you want to continue that? It is a problem of mathematics and very elementary. There is no man here whether he is educated or not—it is elementary, it is a problem of mathematical progression. The money is needed to maintain this project and you must give it or wipe out the whole system. I trust that the House will adopt the Buchanan amendment because it is the nearest amount to meet the financial requirement for the work to be done, and if you do it you will be doing only partial justice. You will then be giving only \$18,000,000 as against \$222,000,000 which is given in pensions for the past wars of our Nation.

This is not to continue indefinitely. It is presumed that it will terminate in three years. Last month there came to this country 365,000 men demobilized, and among those were a great list of casualties. There is no man, there is not any human being, who can tell absolutely how many of these men will come for this training. By reason of your act here in increasing the allowance for support during training from \$75 to \$80 and \$100, you have made it more attractive to the soldiers. They came home from overseas and many of them went immediately to their homes. Now, you have made it attractive by increasing the amount so they can decently support their families while they themselves are away at training. They have had their home welcome. They are now coming back in great numbers to report for training and it thus increases this work. [Applause.]

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, when the President left this country to return to France, just after the adjournment of the last Congress, he made a public statement in which he criticized the action of the Senate in failing to pass some of the largest supply bills, and called attention particularly to the failure of Congress to pass the appropriation for the Railroad Administration. He pointed out how critical was the financial condition of the Railroad Administration, but he made no mention of the failure to pass the bill containing the provision for the Board for Vocational Education.

Now, when the new appropriation bill for the Railroad Administration came before Congress last month the estimate was for \$1,200,000,000, if I remember right. The Director General said that amount was necessary. The appropriation that was carried in the bill was only \$750,000,000, or \$450,000,000 less than the amount estimated by the Railroad Administration as actu-

ally necessary for the railroads. And yet the President approved that bill and signed it, without any protest or complaint.

I am unable to reconcile his action in approving that bill, which was \$450,000,000 short of the amount estimated to be absolutely necessary, with his action in returning this bill with a veto simply because he thought it was somewhat less than the amount estimated to be necessary.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes; for a brief question.

Mr. BEE. Does not the gentleman see the difference between an inanimate railroad and a mangled human soldier?

Mr. DENISON. The President in his statement when he left the country in March called attention to the critical condition of the railroads as the result of the failure of the Senate to pass the railroad appropriation bill; but he did not mention this question, and taking the President's own statement for it, I am sure the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goob] and his committee have not been trying to economize at all at the expense of the wounded soldiers of the country, and everyone here knows he has not been doing so. The bill we passed carried \$6,000,000 for vocational education, an amount sufficient to answer all the demands for many months to come, if not for the entire year. Yes, of course there is a difference between railroads and mangled soldiers, but that is entirely irrelevant to the question. Evidently there are some who have thought there was at least a difference in their votes and political influence.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. No; I have not the time. I do not think the committee have been trying to economize at the expense of anyone. They have been simply trying to use good business judgment in the matter of making appropriations. For that I think the committee should be commended.

But the President by his veto of this bill has put the Members of the House in the attitude of not doing their full duty to the wounded soldiers. Everyone knows that is not the case, and to that extent the President has done the Members of Congress an injustice. And, so far as I am concerned, I am not going to let the President get by with any deal of that kind. I am going to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Buchanan]. I am willing to give to the wounded soldiers every dollar that can be wisely expended for their benefit. The amendment of the gentleman from Texas provides several million dollars more for the rehabilitation of wounded soldiers than the President has recommended, but I shall vote for it just the same.

I have not said a word in the House recently, in fact, not anything at all, as to what I would do for the wounded soldiers. I do not believe much in talking along that line. I think we would better act rather than talk. Talk is cheap; and making a political football out of the wounded soldier's cause ought to be beneath our dignity. In the arrangement made here in the House since the Republicans came into control, I am allowed one little job at \$1,200 a year as a matter of patronage, and I am bringing a young man here to take that job who lost his right arm at Chateau-Thierry. He is a right-handed man, and he has to learn how to write again with his left hand. I think he will be out here in the document room. You gentlemen of the House who go there will sooner or later see him. He may be a little awkward at first and unable to perform all of his duties as gracefully as others would, but when he comes I bespeak for him that kindly consideration which I am sure all of the Members of the House are willing to give to one whose right arm lies buried under the sod of France—a sacrifice for you and for me. I am going to do that to show my appreciation for the men who have come back from the war wounded, and I think that is about as substantial a way of doing it as either getting up here on the floor of the House and making a long, noisy speech, telling them what a friend you are to the soldiers, or sending a veto message here trying to put the Members of the House, who have been honestly economizing and making appropriations upon a sound business basis, in the attitude of not being willing to do all that ought to be done for the soldiers when that is not the fact. [Applause.]

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I can not understand why the President has been subjected to so much criticism on the floor of this House for vetoing the sundry civil appropriation bill when his action is indorsed by the very House itself or will be through the bringing in of an amendment by the Committee on Appropriations of \$6,000,000 more for vocational education than the sundry civil bill carried when it passed. The admission is thereby made by such critics that they did not realize the necessities for caring for this vocational training.

I want to read a few extracts from the statement of Mr. Munroe, vice chairman of the Vocational Board, in his testimony



before the Appropriations Committee, since the veto, as to the amount that is necessary:

Consequently these men to whom we are already obligated for their support and tuition fees will be \$1,400 a year which multiplied by 14,000 is somewhere, as I figure it, about \$18,000,000 required merely for the board, lodging, and tuition of these men. Now, that makes no provision for their medical care. A great many of them, of course, will need very careful care. It makes no provision for their supervision while they are in this course of training and, as you know, gentlemen, we have to very carefully supervise their courses to see that they are carried out as we have planned them to be. It makes no provision for the necessary travel which many of them must take from one place to another. It makes no provision for the administration of a work of this size and there is nothing left absolutely for taking up the problem of the thousands and thousands of other men who have already been surveyed up to the number of 98,000. That is, we have placed under the system 12,000, we are obligated to train about 14,000, that makes 26,000, and in addition to that there are 78,000 men who have been surveyed and whose cases must be followed up as quickly as possible. We have registered a total of 147,000 cases, of which there are 49,000 men who have never been followed up at all and who must be followed up at once. The estimate is that there are probably 60,000 or 70,000 more men still in hospitals and still in the field, and many of those are passably not on our rolls at all.

Consequently, gentlemen, the figures that we have ahead of us, as we have told you repeatedly, are figures that no one could foresee. We are growing every day. The average number of cases that is being acted upon every day by our district offices is 150, which has to be added to the figure I have already given you. No one can foresee the size of this problem during the coming year.

As we have said repeatedly at the hearings before your committee and to Members of both Houses, we take it for granted that when Congress passed this legislation in June, 1918, they proposed that this job should be done not only thoroughly but that it should be done promptly, and that no disabled boy should be kept waiting for more than a reasonable length of time before he should be put into training.

This House can not afford not to give this appropriation for this training, because the board needs it now. We contemplate getting back the last of all of these wounded men, ready to be examined by this board, in a few months, and the strain upon the resources of the Vocational Board will come within that time. It does not behoove Congress to say that this board shall be hampered by a lack of money; that the Congress shall be hesitant about offering these men the facilities they need to become reconstructed.

When the very life of this Nation was at stake and the liberties and safety not only of our own citizens but of those of the allied world were in jeopardy, the American soldiers, sailors, and marines did not hesitate to offer their lives as a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom. Neither they nor those who held them dear refused to have their lives and safety appropriated in defense of civilization and all that mankind cherishes and values highest; and yet it seems that a Republican majority of this House is refusing to appropriate now the dollars that are necessary to give the Americans who suffered wounds in this war the right and opportunity to be restored physically, and to a life of usefulness when peace has come upon us.

It is a strange doctrine of economy—stranger, too, when it is remembered that scarcely eight months ago every dollar and resource of this Nation was pledged to a process of destruction. No one clamored then for false economies, because they realized that it was no time for such action; that this country would have no patience with it, and that the safety of this land and of civilization could not be jeopardized by a failure to appropriate money enough for cannon, ammunition, rifles, battleships, submarines, destroyers, and articles of every kind which either might or could prove useful in winning the war.

But now, when we come to the period of peace and are embarked upon the processes of restoration of our wounded and are endeavoring to provide hospitals, schools and training, and agencies of every kind to build up and re-create the wounded and shattered American soldiers, sailors, and marines, it ill befits a grateful Nation to indulge in practices of economy at the expense of such heroes; and such action will not be regarded by the people of this land as any real economy, but will be taken and looked upon as a badge of humiliation and shame.

It is one thing to try to make a record of economy; it is quite another to overlook in so doing the priceless generosity and sacrifices made by the young manhood of America in the fearful World War.

I believe that the people of the United States will have no sympathy and no patience with plausible excuses and reasons why an adequate appropriation of money for this vocational work was not made. It will not do to take refuge in realms of skepticism and doubt as to the wisdom of providing the Vocational Board now with sufficient funds to give these wounded boys every chance and every facility to be as fully restored as they can be to begin all over again the task of earning an honest living in the field of civil life.

The Nation not only owes them this; it owes them more. The debt can never be paid. The memory of the heroic deeds of these men will never fade from the pages of history, and will

always be enshrined in the hearts of the families, mothers and fathers, wives and children, and their fellow countrymen.

In every one of the millions of homes throughout this land that gave some one of the family to the service of their country there will be preserved with tender and affectionate care the uniforms and symbols of service of those who were enlisted in the service of their country. They will always be precious mementos of the unsurpassed courage and valor of the American soldiers, sailors, and marines who came from the city and from the country, from the farm and from the store, from the school and from the industries; in fact, from every walk of our complex civil life; who loving the arts of peace rather than those of war, yet cheerfully subjected themselves to the severest kind of training and discipline and became the greatest fighters in the world.

Their deeds of supreme bravery, their glorious successes on land and sea, their willingness to endure without complaint the hardships, dangers, and suffering daily encountered, will always constitute a record of which their fellow countrymen will never cease to be proud.

In the crucial and thrilling engagements at St. Mihiel, Chateau-Thierry, and Belleau Wood, where the American soldiers and marines checked for the first time the crushing advance of the German armies and hurled them back with such overwhelming force that the ultimate destruction of the Hun forces was assured, the world and civilization felt for the first time in many weary months its anxiety vanish, and became convinced that right, truth, and justice would prevail.

I wish that time and opportunity were now accorded me to refer in more detail to those glorious and wonderful campaigns in France and Belgium and in other lands, and to make a fuller mention of the indispensable service and memorable triumphs of the Navy in driving the German submarine from the sea and transporting to France in safety over 2,000,000 American soldiers and marines. Their heroic deeds and sacrifices, however, do not have to be recalled to the loved ones of these men or to their countrymen. They are too deeply embedded in the hearts of all to ever be forgotten.

But in treasuring such a record of imperishable fame and glory as these heroes have given America, it would be unworthy beyond expression to forget the needs and welfare of the men who made it.

Every wound and every disability sustained by them in the service of their country is a badge of signal honor and distinction. But in the struggle for existence they are also serious handicaps.

As far as is humanly possible, the Nation must restore them, and restore them now, to a state of health and economic independence. They are not objects of charity, will never be so regarded, and ought not to be. All the money that is needed should be generously appropriated, and appropriated now, when the need is greatest for restoration and training for the various occupations they may be able to follow.

It is not surprising that the members of the Vocational Board should not be able to estimate with absolute certainty the exact amount of money which will be needed in the next 12 months to educate, train, and support the wounded and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines who are entitled to the benefits of the vocational act. When it is considered that 230,074 men were actually disabled by wounds in battle, and that another vast number, yet undetermined, were disabled by disease, exposure, and illness during the war, all of whom are entitled to the benefits of treatment, training, and support under the provisions of this act, it is apparent that it is impossible for the Vocational Board to state with certainty what the precise financial needs of the board will be in order to admit to such training, when they apply, all those who are entitled to receive it.

It is not sufficient to excuse an adequate appropriation now, to urge that a serious deficiency can be taken care of later when it develops.

When the recent amendment to the vocational act was passed by Congress in January it carried an appropriation of \$6,000,000 for the board. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. Good] sought, when the bill was before the House, to have that appropriation stricken out upon the ground that an adequate and sufficient amount of \$4,000,000 had already been provided in the sundry civil bill, passed by the House, and then before the Senate. But the House of Representatives refused to agree with the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and insisted upon appropriating the additional \$6,000,000 in the vocational act, in addition to the \$4,000,000 carried in the sundry civil bill, making the total appropriation for vocational training amount to \$10,000,000 in all.



When the sundry civil bill went to conference between the House and Senate the conference reported back to Congress a provision increasing the amount for vocational training in the sundry civil bill from four to six million dollars; in that provision, however, was included a clause repealing the \$6,000,000 appropriation carried in the vocational bill. It was due to the erroneous conclusion at that time of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and to his representation to the House that \$6,000,000 was all that the Appropriations Committee had found was needed by the Vocational Board. The sundry civil bill, in spite of its urgency, was finally passed.

The President of the United States, however, vetoed the sundry civil bill, because he found that the sum of \$6,000,000 was totally inadequate and the limitations on the administrative features of the vocational bill altogether too severe.

After such veto message was presented to Congress the Appropriations Committee held additional hearings, and in those it was disclosed that the very least amount which the board would need for the next 12 months was \$18,000,000.

Now, while the Appropriations Committee has consented to allow the board to retain the \$6,000,000 appropriated for it in June, but taken from it in the sundry civil bill, and increases such sum by proposing to allow another \$6,000,000, making a total appropriation of \$12,000,000 in all for the fiscal year ending in 1920, yet it now appears from this very recent testimony before the Appropriations Committee that this amount will fall short by \$6,000,000 of the least amount actually needed to pay for the board, lodging, and tuition of the men already in training and whose applications have already been approved.

In other words, the least amount needed now is \$18,000,000. If the Buchanan amendment is adopted, this sum will be provided; but if this amendment is defeated, in my opinion it will mean serious denial to thousands who need this training now more than they will ever need it at any other time and when its benefits will be the greatest.

Let Congress show by its acts as well as by its words that it values beyond price the services and sacrifices which the American soldier, sailor, and marine made for his country, humanity, and the safety and liberties of all, and that it means to deal most generously with those who are wounded and disabled in helping them back to a life of further service and usefulness and to an opportunity to face the world again upon an equal plane with their more fortunate fellow men. The adoption of the Buchanan amendment will be a step in the right direction, but its defeat will, to say the least, indicate rather a spirit of indifference or false economy that the Nation will resent and not forget when it calls upon its public servants for an accounting and an explanation as to how they have discharged the trusts committed to their care. [Applause.]

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to speak upon the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, in order that we may not be confused as to the status of the appropriation for this service, I want to refer to the statement made while the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] was on the floor. The only estimate made through the Secretary of the Treasury as required by law was the estimate for \$4,000,000 for the whole year. Subsequently a letter was written to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations increasing this to \$6,000,000, and this was subsequently reduced by the board to \$2,500,000. Congress enacted a law amending section 2 of the act, carrying \$6,000,000, so that if there had been no further action by Congress the Vocational Board now would have for the next year \$6,000,000 in addition to the \$2,000,000 appropriated by the original act. The \$2,000,000 was all used before the end of the fiscal year or by that time. Congress by this bill gives \$6,000,000 more, or \$12,000,000, which is \$8,000,000 in excess of the actual estimate of the department.

I want the Members of the House to remember that in order to give the Committee on Appropriations jurisdiction in the orderly way it is necessary for the Secretary of the Treasury to send an estimate to the Speaker of the House that so much money is required for a given service. No such additional estimate has been made. Let us not cheapen the soldier, let us not

cheapen ourselves, by voting for an appropriation that has never been estimated for by anyone.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. For a question.

Mr. RUCKER. How much does it cost per soldier for the term of 10 months?

Mr. GOOD. The facts are that while a great deal of loose talk has been going around as to what it is going to cost to rehabilitate a soldier no one knows. Some of them are in training for 10 days and some of them are in training for 4 years. The statement was made that it would cost \$1,400 per year, if they were in that long.

Mr. RUCKER. Has not the gentleman some idea of the number now in training and the number at the door waiting to enter; and if the gentleman has that information, why can not this House multiply the one by the other and make the appropriation, whether it is estimated for or not?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that is a fair question, and you could do it if you knew whether or not they would be there 10 days or—

Mr. RUCKER rose.

Mr. GOOD. I can not yield further.

Mr. RUCKER. It would not be used.

Mr. GOOD. The director said on Sunday it would take about six weeks to educate a barber to perform those duties. Now, are you going to give him training for a whole year? He said it would take several months to educate a carpenter. Are you going, now, to give training or the money for training for a whole year and pay that much, when it can not be stated until the service or training is completed? I undertake to say this service ought to be done now. These boys ought to be rehabilitated now and not wait until they are older men. There is no disposition in any way to stop this work. I want to encourage them to give the training as rapidly as possible to these men, but I want to say to the House that we ought to act sanely. When this matter was up before the Committee on Appropriations not a Member objected because the amount was not high enough. No one, so far as I know, was displeased with regard to this amount. It is \$8,000,000 more than the amount estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury. It is \$4,000,000 more than the amount estimated by the President himself, and the only statement that is made here with regard—

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I can not yield. The only statement then made was made by Mr. Munroe, who says, "We do not know; our limited experience will not permit us to state whether or not this will cost \$18,000,000 or \$25,000,000, or how much it will cost." All Mr. Munroe asked, so far as I am advised, was that the appropriation of \$4,000,000 be restored. He did not ask even for the \$6,000,000 that the committee has reported. The committee thought that perhaps there might be a recess and it was willing to give at least two-thirds of the maximum guessed at to carry this service well into next year before it would be necessary to take further action. But the Committee on Appropriations so far as I am concerned will be entirely satisfied with whatever action the House may take upon this matter. I know that every Member of the House is interested in the rehabilitation of these boys. They ought to be interested, but at the same time we ought to make our appropriations in a way that when we go before our constituents we can say to them that we did not give more money than was reasonably estimated for the service.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. WHEELER. After the deduction of salaries under this bill which is now under consideration what will be left for the benefit of the soldier boys, roughly speaking?

Mr. GOOD. The amount estimated here in the letter I read to-day is \$3,488,000 for salaries. The limitation put in the bill will effect a saving, as I recall, of about \$100,000.

Mr. WHEELER. Three million dollars for teachers—

Mr. GOOD. No; this is for employees and does not refer to teachers. I do not know to what extent that will reflect in the employment of other persons. I do not know and nobody knows whether it will be necessary to have all of those at present employed. Dr. Prosser stated last February the 1st day of June this part of the work would commence to decline and he would commence to discharge these men in six months. That was the peak load, as the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] stated when the matter was before the House, but Dr. Prosser stated then that the work would be at its height about the month of June. And so I do not know how long it is going to take. No man knows how long it will take to do the work

or how many of this force that is estimated for here will be on the pay roll all the balance of the year. Here is what he said:

It must be remembered that this is temporary service and that many of these employees will finish their service within the next six months.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired by direction of the committee.

The question now is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that that be divided. It is in two parts.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to dividing it.

Mr. KREIDER. May it be reported?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the Clerk to report the first part of the substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let it all be read, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GARD. Can it not all be read?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman mean now?

Mr. GARD. Yes; for our information.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCHANAN as a substitute for the Madden amendment: Amend the bill by striking out the figures "\$6,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$12,000,000"; and add, at the end of the provision, after the word "each," the following provision, to wit: "And provided further, That not more than 18 per cent of all appropriations made by Congress on this subject shall be used for the payment of salaries."

The CHAIRMAN. The question first to be decided is upon the amount, which I will ask the Clerk to read to the House under the order of the separation.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, would it be in order to discuss that division of the proposed question?

The CHAIRMAN. All debate has ended.

Mr. RUCKER. I want to discuss that and two or three other matters incident to it for two or three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first part of the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the figures "\$6,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$12,000,000."

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. GOOD. I ask for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 83, noes 96.

Mr. CALDWELL. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I think some gentlemen in the House probably should know what they are voting on.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goop] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] will take their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 120, noes 119.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FESS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote now comes on the second part of the substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas. The Clerk will report it.

Mr. FESS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FESS. With 120 for and 119 against, if the Chair would vote against it, the amendment would fail? Did the Chair vote?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not vote on this unless he passes between the tellers. [Applause.] The Clerk will report the second part of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end of the provision, after the word "each," the following provision, to wit:

"And provided further, That not more than 18 per cent of all appropriations made by Congress on this subject shall be used for the payment of salaries."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment that I desire to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. Amendment to what?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. There is one amendment pending. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] as amended.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts demands a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 104, noes 136.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I demand tellers, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Tellers are demanded.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. Goon and Mr. BUCHANAN to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 136, noes 139.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I ask the Clerk to report.

Mr. MADDEN. I move, Mr. Chairman, an amendment to strike out the "\$6,000,000" and make it "\$9,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Ohio. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FESS: After the word "this" strike out the words "or any other."

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, in the seventh line from the bottom—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I would like to have the gentleman from Ohio yield in order to have it read. There is no conflict between us. I think the amendment would be accepted by the committee.

Mr. FESS. I yield for the reading of the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BANKHEAD: After the word "this" in the proviso, strike out the words "or any other," add a comma and the additional words "and the act approved July —, 1919, amending section 2 of the act of June 27, 1918."

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, the proviso or the explanatory phrase or clause given by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] just identifies the law that we want to preserve, and I would have no objection to accepting that explanatory statement in connection with the amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. GOOD. I would like to know just what is in the mind of the gentleman in regard to the effect this provision will have that will be cured by the amendment, whichever one is adopted.

Mr. FESS. I will state to the chairman and to the members of the committee that the Smith-Hughes vocational bill, approved June 27, 1918, carries an annual appropriation, when it is at its maximum, of \$7,000,000, to be administered by the Federal Government, in connection with a similar amount to be supplied by the various States; and in order to administer this amount the Vocational Board has divided the United States into 15 vocational districts, over each of which there is a director, and these 15 directors have a salary now fixed at \$3,500 each; and the limitation in the bill we are now acting upon is limited to the rehabilitation of the soldiers, while this goes on to this act and will embarrass 15 regional directors, 2 assistants to the board, and in all 22 members that I do not believe the committee wanted to touch at all.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. GOOD. The amendment as it is drawn, I understand, will make this provision in the appropriation of \$6,000,000 carried in the bill amending section 2 amenable to the limitation?

Mr. FESS. It will.

Mr. GOOD. I have no objection to the amendment of the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. I am very much obliged.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, would not my substitute be voted on first?

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's substitute be voted upon instead of the amendment that I offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the substitute will be voted on instead of the original.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.



The CHAIRMAN. Let the amendment be read first.  
The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BANKHEAD: After the word "this" strike out the words "or any other," and after the word "act" insert the words "or the act approved July —, 1919, amending section 2 of the act approved June 27, 1918," so that as amended the language will read "Provided, That no person (except the members of the Federal Board for Vocational Education) shall be paid by said board out of the appropriation contained in this act or the act approved July —, 1919, amending section 2 of the act approved June 27, 1918, at a rate of compensation exceeding \$2,500 per annum," etc.

Mr. GOOD. There is no objection to that.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I am somewhat confused on that. I want to ask the gentleman from Alabama whether he is sure that the wording of his explanatory clause will extend to the Smith-Hughes bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think it specifically excludes the operation of this proviso from any effect on the original Smith-Hughes Act, and limits this restriction of salary to the act which we are now passing and the act amending section 2.

Mr. FESS. We do not want this limitation to extend to the Smith-Hughes Act.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is what I am seeking to exclude by my substitute.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LEVER. Is the vote being taken on the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama as a substitute or as an amendment? I understood that the gentleman offered it as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. As a substitute. Those in favor of the amendment as now presented will signify it by saying aye.

The substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to offer an amendment?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. I think in view of that amendment it is not necessary, unless I have misunderstood the force of the amendment, to retain the words which are in parentheses—

(Except the members of the Federal Board for Vocational Education.)

Mr. BANKHEAD. I agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. GOOD. I move to strike out the words included in the parentheses—

(Except the members of the Federal Board for Vocational Education.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOOD: After the word "persons" in the proviso strike out the words in the parentheses—" (except the members of the Federal Board for Vocational Education)." "

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. I move to amend the figures "\$6,000,000" by striking them out and inserting in lieu thereof "\$9,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MADDEN: Strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$9,000,000."

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask for a division.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I want recognition for the purpose of offering a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. Was the gentleman on his feet asking recognition?

Mr. KINCHELOE. I was.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will send up his amendment.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I move to amend by striking out the word "nine" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "ten."

Mr. MADDEN. I accept that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The substitute offered by the gentleman from Kentucky will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KINCHELOE offers a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. MADDEN by striking out "\$9,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$10,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. KINCHELOE) there were—ayes 116, noes 154.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. Good and Mr. KINCHELOE.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 123, noes 148.

Accordingly the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs now on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] to strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$9,000,000."

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. MADDEN) there were—ayes 126, noes 151.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$7,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MADDEN: Strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$7,500,000."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MADDEN) there were 104 ayes and 159 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$6,500,000."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman's motion is dilatory. He has offered amendments in several amounts and they have all been voted down.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think the Chair will undertake to sustain any such point of order as that.

Mr. WALSH. The Chair will rule on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. Are there any other amendments to be offered?

Mr. SABATH. Upon what ground does the Chair sustain the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Upon the ground that it is dilatory. The amount that the gentleman has moved to insert is between the two amounts voted down.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois appeals from the decision of the Chair. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the committee?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MADDEN) there were 163 ayes and 83 noes.

So the decision of the Chair was sustained.

The Clerk continued the reading of the bill.

During the reading the following occurred:

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is possible for the Clerk to read a page of this bill in less than six seconds. I expect the bill to be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading in order.

Subsequently:

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I object to the Clerk turning over four or five pages of manuscript while he reads one. I have been watching.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed in order.

Subsequently:

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the pages being read that were turned over. I protest. I want it distinctly understood that as a Member of this House I have rights here. I do not propose to let the Chair sit complacently by and permit that thing to be done.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will call attention to any particular part of the bill that has not been read, the Chair will see that it is read.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not propose to allow the Chairman to permit the Clerk to turn over five or six pages of manuscript without reading.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading in order.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Labor, pursuant to section 1 of the act approved March 4, 1913, entitled "An act to create a Department of Labor," to continue to foster, promote, to develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, to advance their opportunities for profitable employment by maintaining a national system of employment offices in the several States and political subdivisions thereof, and to coordinate the public employment offices throughout the country by furnishing and publishing information as to opportunities for employment, and by maintaining a system for clearing labor between the several States, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and for their actual necessary traveling expenses while absent from their official station, together with their per diem in lieu of subsistence, when allowed, pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act, approved August 1, 1914, supplies and equipment, telegraph and telephone service, and printing and binding, \$400,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against this section for the reason that it is new legislation on an appropriation bill and that there is no legislation passed by this Congress authorizing such an appropriation. I call attention of the Chair to the fact that every Chairman during this Congress has sustained this point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman's point of order comes too late. No points of order have been reserved on the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I insist that it is not too late. I understand it is the usual custom for some chairman of a committee, or some gentleman, when a bill is reported, to reserve all points of order. I am reliably informed, by an authority that I consider good from a parliamentary standpoint, that it is not necessary and that there is no purpose or reason whatever for reserving points of order, because any Member of the House has the right and privilege to make a point of order upon the conclusion of the reading of any paragraph in the bill. I submit that that is parliamentary law.

I call attention further to the fact that the bill was brought in here under a rule of the committee. It is not printed, and not a Member of the House has an opportunity to know what it contains. If a Member calls for a copy of it, it is impossible to get one. I submit that the point of order should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair holds that unless there is a reservation under circumstances of this kind a point of order can not be entertained to a part or a section of the bill. It seems to the Chair clear that points of order must be reserved, else it is the duty of the committee to report the bill as it is. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 7343, the sundry civil appropriation bill, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is considered ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the amendments will be put en grosse. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MADDEN. At what stage of the proceedings will it be in order to move to recommit the bill?

The SPEAKER. After the third reading. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. BLANTON, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. MADDEN rose.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am against the bill, and I desire to make a motion to recommit the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], a member of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Has not a Member of the House who is against the bill the privilege first of offering a motion to recommit?

The SPEAKER. Certainly. The gentleman need not make that inquiry. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to offer a motion to recommit?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Any bill that fails to provide for the disabled soldiers of this country—that does not do it adequately—I am opposed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not answer the question. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to recommit, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion to recommit offered by Mr. BUCHANAN: "I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to immediately report the same back to the House with the following amendment to the paragraph providing for vocational rehabilitation: 'First, strike out the figures '\$6,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof the figures '\$12,000,000,' and by adding at the end of the paragraph

immediately after the word 'each' the following, to wit: That not more than 18 per cent of all appropriations made by Congress on this subject shall be used for the payment of salaries."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the previous question.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment to the motion to recommit made by the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER. If the previous question is voted down an amendment will be in order; otherwise not. The question is on ordering the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRISP) there were—ayes 103, noes 131.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York demands the yeas and nays. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Twenty-two Members have risen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

So the previous question was rejected.

Mr. GOOD rose.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer as a substitute for the motion to recommit, that the figures "\$12,000,000" be stricken out and the figures "\$6,500,000" be inserted in lieu thereof, and on that I demand the previous question.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa has moved the previous question on his amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. He can not make both motions at once, can he?

The SPEAKER. He can not. He makes first one and then the other. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MADDEN. Is an amendment to the substitute now in order?

The SPEAKER. Not after the previous question is ordered. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa to the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Good amendment may be again reported.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] asks unanimous consent that the Good amendment be again reported. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is a substitute instead of an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Good moves as a substitute to the motion offered by Mr. BUCHANAN to strike out "\$12,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,500,000."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, the substitute I offered was to strike out \$6,000,000 and put in \$6,500,000. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, what are we voting on?

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. CANNON. I want to find out what we are voting on.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has just asked the Clerk to report the amendment. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Good offers as a substitute to the motion to recommit by striking out—

Mr. GOOD sent the written amendment to the Clerk's desk. [Cries of "No!"]

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa be reduced to writing.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will see that the House has fair play. The House will be in order and gentlemen will be seated. The Clerk will report the amendment originally offered by the gentleman from Iowa. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Good moves as a substitute to the motion to recommit to strike out "\$12,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,500,000."

[Applause.]



Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOOD. The substitute I offered was reduced to writing by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] at my request. I read it from the table instead of sending it to the desk, and if any mention was made— [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. GOOD. If any mention was made of \$12,000,000 it was an inadvertence. [Cries of "Yes!"]

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman said \$6,000,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry. Could I withdraw—

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I object to a withdrawal of it.

The SPEAKER. In the committee a Member has not a right to change his amendment, but in the House a gentleman has—

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRISP. I grant a man has a right to withdraw his amendment or motion in the House before the House has taken action on it, but here the previous question has been ordered and it cuts off any other amendment or right to withdraw the amendment. Here is a motion made to recommit. I know the Speaker is fair, I know the Speaker wants to do right. Now, this is a simple matter. If the gentleman from Iowa got himself in a hole it is not the province of the Speaker to pull him out. [Applause.] The gentleman from Texas offered a motion to recommit, which was clearly in order under the rules of the House. That motion provided that the committee should report the bill back instantaneously appropriating \$12,000,000 for the rehabilitation of indigent soldiers, and the gentleman from Iowa offered a substitute—and the Speaker knows a substitute is nothing in the world but an amendment—now, the gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment which is denominated a substitute providing for striking out \$12,000,000 and inserting \$6,500,000. He could not strike out \$6,000,000 because it was not in the motion; \$12,000,000 was in it. It provides for striking out that and puts in \$6,500,000, and on that he demanded the previous question. The House has ordered the previous question. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment of the gentleman to strike out \$12,000,000 and insert \$6,500,000, and the Speaker had directed the calling of the roll. And certainly under those conditions the gentleman can not now withdraw his amendment. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a statement. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] had offered an amendment to strike out "\$6,000,000" in the bill and insert "\$12,000,000." I have offered a substitute to strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$6,500,000." [Cries of "No, no!"] Mr. Speaker, I want to be fair with the House. What I said in offering the substitute was to strike out "\$12,000,000" and corrected myself by saying "\$6,000,000." And the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] and others who were standing near me here heard perfectly what I said and will verify this statement. I had the substitute as prepared by Mr. WALSH lying on my desk while I was reading from it, and that will speak for itself.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. KREIDER. To make a parliamentary inquiry. Is it in order to offer a substitute to strike figures out of a bill that are not contained in it? If there is "\$6,000,000" in the bill, the gentleman can not offer a substitute to strike out "\$12,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks he must be bound by the record as reported by the Clerk, and if the amendment which is before the House is the amendment as reported by the Clerk—

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, if the Clerk reported what the gentleman did not say—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman sent it to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. BLANTON. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. NOLAN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is mistaken. The Chair understood that the Clerk reported what was sent up to the desk.

Mr. CRISP. May I respectfully ask the Speaker to have the Reporter read his notes?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be glad to have the Reporter read his notes.

Mr. GARNER. That is all right.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the previous question was ordered.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. What is the point of order?

Mr. CALDWELL. The point of order I make is that it is too late to reconsider, because a roll call has already been ordered on the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. CALDWELL. The yeas-and-nays vote has been ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is in order to move to reconsider.

Mr. NOLAN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is this: Is the substitute for a motion to recommit in order unless it is reduced to writing?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognized it. The Chair, with the permission of the House, will have the Reporter's notes read.

Mr. NOLAN. Will the Chair answer my parliamentary inquiry? Does not the rule require that the motion to recommit must be reduced to writing?

Mr. CRISP. I never heard of that rule. I wish the gentleman would cite me to it.

The SPEAKER. The House will please preserve order. The Chair recognizes the excitement and the lateness of the hour, but the Chair also recognizes that all men on both sides want exact justice to be done.

The Chair will follow the suggestion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] and have the Reporter's notes read, and, as he stated before, will abide by them. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer as a substitute for the motion to recommit that the figures "\$12,000,000" be stricken out and the figures "\$6,500,000" be inserted in lieu thereof, and on that I demand the previous question.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa to reconsider the motion by which the previous question was ordered.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FESS. This was offered as a substitute. Must not the substitute go to the part that is originally recommitted and can not as a substitute amend the recommitment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think so.

Mr. GARNER. Regular order, Mr. Speaker. We will never get through here without the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa to reconsider the vote whereby the yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WINGO. The yeas and nays have been ordered. It is too late. It is too late to reconsider.

Mr. GARNER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair had forgotten that. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa to reconsider the vote.

Mr. WINGO. No. The yeas and nays have been ordered. It is too late for the vote to be reconsidered. The yeas and nays were asked for and sustained.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, you can move to reconsider.

Mr. WINGO. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the roll call was ordered. It is too late.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for order. Make those men sit down over there. Get the Sergeant at Arms out.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, may we have order on the Democratic side? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order. The question is—

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the action by which the yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LEVER. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. CRISP. I would like to make this point of order, to find out if the gentleman voted, ordering the yeas and nays on the previous question.

Mr. GOOD. I did.

Mr. CRISP. I make the point of order that unless he voted with the prevailing side he can not make the motion to reconsider.

Mr. GOOD. I remember that I was one of the persons who stood up on this side asking for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to get recognition for some time.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. CALDWELL. I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CALDWELL. It is this, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. There is already a point of order pending. You can not make another while that is pending.

Mr. CALDWELL. What is the pending point of order?

The SPEAKER. The point of order pending is the point of order made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] that the motion to reconsider must have been made by a person who voted on the prevailing side.

Mr. CALDWELL. The point of order I make is that the motion of the gentleman is out of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, it is suggested by some Members that the calling of the roll had begun, and that one or two Members' names had been called.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that is not correct. The question is on the motion to reconsider the vote whereby the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded.

The House proceeded to divide.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the indulgence of the Chair a moment to make a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. This has been presented to me—the question was just submitted. I am frank to say I do not know about it, but I am going to submit it to the Speaker: What the House is now dividing on is whether you will reconsider ordering the yeas and nays. This idea has been presented to me, and it is true, that the Constitution fixes how you get the yeas and nays, it providing that one-fifth of those present under the Constitution may demand the yeas and nays; and if you have a majority of the House to decide that you will not have the yeas and nays, you are violating plainly that provision of the Constitution which requires one-fifth to order the yeas and nays.

Now, I know that the Chair wants to do right, and I want to present that thought to the Chair; and on reflection it does not look to me as though we had the right to take this vote, because in that way a majority of the House can absolutely frustrate the Constitution of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The majority can not deprive the one-fifth of their constitutional right.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is disposed to think that the House has a right to reconsider the motion for the yeas and nays, but if it does so of course immediately the motion is pending, and one-fifth of the House could order the yeas and nays again, so that it seems to the Chair that the question is one of propriety and of usefulness rather than of parliamentary law. The Chair thinks that the motion to reconsider is in order.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHELAN. If that is correct, suppose the House orders the yeas and nays by one-fifth of the Members standing, and suppose a majority reconsider that. Then suppose, as suggested by the Chair, that the one-fifth again order the yeas and nays. Then suppose again by a majority vote the House reconsiders that motion. Can the Chair tell me what the end of the whole proposition would be?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the second motion to reconsider would be a dilatory motion. But the Chair does not see why it is not now in order to reconsider the vote by which the yeas and nays were ordered. It might happen that on reflection the whole House might want to do away with the ordering of the yeas and nays and ought to have an opportunity to do it.

Mr. PHELAN. A parliamentary inquiry. Suppose the House now reconsiders the ordering of the yeas and nays. Will anything be permitted to intervene before somebody has the right again to ask for the yeas and nays in the same manner?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. PHELAN. Then the first thing in order after reconsideration will be another demand for the yeas and nays. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. PHELAN. The first thing in order is the right of somebody to ask for a roll call?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must not take the time of the House by repeating a question which has already been answered.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARNER. Suppose the House reconsiders the vote by which the yeas and nays were ordered. That question is reconsidered. Then does the question come back whether the House will reconsider the motion by which the previous question has been ordered?

The SPEAKER. No; the Chair has already stated that the Chair thinks that immediately the question would recur on ordering the yeas and nays, which, under the Constitution, can be ordered by one-fifth.

Mr. GARNER. All right. We have more than one-fifth, and that is enough.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CALDWELL. On a request for the yeas and nays one-fifth of those present rising are enough to order the yeas and nays. On the motion to reconsider if more than one-fifth rise in opposition to reconsidering, is not the motion to reconsider lost?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks these parliamentary questions will be answered by the action of the House.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Do I understand the Speaker to say that if the House decides to reconsider the motion by which the yeas and nays were ordered it will not then immediately be in order for a Member to move to reconsider the vote by which the previous question was ordered?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not, if one-fifth of the House should then demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. GOOD. Then I withdraw the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the motion is withdrawn.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for order.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. BLANTON. The regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is that the House shall be in order. Business will be suspended until the House is in order.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House do now adjourn.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CRISP. The yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 198, nays 160, answered "present" 1, not voting 71, as follows:

#### YEAS—198.

Ackerman	Ellsworth	Kelly, Pa.	Nolan
Anderson	Elston	Kennedy, R. I.	Ogden
Andrews, Md.	Esch	Kinkaid	Osborne
Andrews, Nebr.	Evans, Nebr.	Klecka	Paige
Bacharach	Fess	Knutson	Parker
Baer	Focht	Kraus	Platt
Barbour	Fordney	Kreider	Radcliffe
Begg	Foster	LaGuardia	Ramsey
Benham	Frear	Lampert	Ramseyer
Boles	French	Langley	Randall, Wis.
Bowers	Fuller, Mass.	Layton	Reavis
Brooks, Ill.	Garland	Leibach	Reber
Brooks, Pa.	Glynn	Little	Reed, N. Y.
Browning	Good	Luce	Rhodes
Burdick	Goodykoontz	Lutkin	Ricketts
Burke	Gould	Luhning	Riddick
Burroughs	Graham, Pa.	McCulloch	Robison, Ky.
Butler	Graham, Ill.	McKenzie	Rodenberg
Campbell, Kans.	Green, Iowa	McKinley	Rogers
Cannon	Greene, Mass.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Rose
Chandler	Hadley	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Rowe
Christopherson	Hamilton	McPherson	Sanders, Ind.
Clason	Hardy, Colo.	MacCrata	Sanders, N. Y.
Cole	Haskell	MacGregor	Sanford
Cooper	Haugen	Madden	Schall
Crago	Hawley	Magee	Scott
Cramton	Hays	Mapes	Sells
Crowther	Hernandez	Merritt	Shreve
Currie, Mich.	Hersey	Michener	Siegel
Curry, Calif.	Hickey	Miller	Sinnot
Dale	Hill	Mondell	Smith, Idaho
Dallinger	Hoch	Moore, Ohio	Smith, Ill.
Darrow	Houghton	Moore, Pa.	Smith, Mich.
Davis, Minn.	Hull, Iowa	Moore, Ind.	Snell
Dempsey	Husted	Morgan	Snyder
Denison	Hutchinson	Morin	Steensson
Dickinson, Iowa	Ireland	Mott	Stephens, Ohio
Dowell	James	Mudd	Strong, Kans.
Dunbar	Jeffers	Murphy	Strong, Pa.
Dunn	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nelson, Wis.	Summers, Wash.
Dyer	Juul	Newton, Minn.	Sweet
Edmonds	Kearns	Newton, Mo.	Taylor, Tenn.
Elliott	Kelley, Mich.	Nichols, Mich.	Temple



Thompson, Ohio	Vaile	Ward	Williams
Tilson	Vare	Wason	Winslow
Timberlake	Vestal	Watson, Pa.	Yates
Tincher	Voigt	Webster	Young, N. Dak.
Tinkham	Volstead	Wheeler	Zihlman
Towner	Walsh	White, Kans.	
Treadway	Walters	White, Me.	

## NAYS—160.

Alexander	Dickinson, Mo.	Larsen	Robinson, N. C.
Almon	Dominick	Lazaro	Romjue
Aswell	Donovan	Lea, Calif.	Rouse
Ayres	Dooling	Leshner	Rowan
Bankhead	Doremus	Lever	Rubey
Barkley	Doughton	Loneragan	Rucker
Bee	Drane	McAndrews	Sabath
Bell	Dupré	McDuffie	Saunders, Va.
Benson	Eagan	McGlennon	Sears
Black	Ferris	McKeown	Sherwood
Blackmon	Fields	McKiniry	Sisson
Bland, Mo.	Fisher	McLane	Small
Bland, Va.	Fitzgerald	Maher	Smith, N. Y.
Blanton	Gallagher	Major	Smithwick
Boohar	Gallivan	Mansfield	Steagall
Box	Gandy	Martin	Stedman
Brand	Ganly	Mays	Steele
Briggs	Gard	Mead	Stevenson
Brisson	Garner	Minahan, N. J.	Summers, Tex.
Buchanan	Garrett	Montague	Taylor, Ark.
Byrnes, S. C.	Godwin, N. C.	Moon	Taylor, Colo.
Byrnes, Tenn.	Goodwin, Ark.	Mooney	Thomas
Caldwell	Hardy, Tex.	Nelson, Mo.	Thompson, Okla.
Campbell, Pa.	Harrison	Nicholls, S. C.	Tillman
Candler	Hastings	O'Connell	Upshaw
Cantrill	Hayden	Oldfield	Venable
Carew	Hersman	Oliver	Vinson
Carss	Holland	Olney	Watkins
Carter	Howard	Overstreet	Weaver
Casey	Hudspeth	Padgett	Webb
Clark, Mo.	Humphreys	Park	Welling
Cleary	Igoe	Parrish	Welty
Coady	Jacoway	Pell	Whaley
Collier	Johnson, Ky.	Phelan	Wilson, La.
Connally	Johnson, Miss.	Quin	Wilson, Pa.
Crisp	Johnston, N. Y.	Ragsdale	Wingo
Cullen	Jones, Tex.	Rainey, J. W.	Wise
Davey	Kincheloe	Raker	Woods, Va.
Davis, Tenn.	Lanham	Rayburn	Wright
Dent	Lankford	Riordan	Young, Tex.

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Dewalt

## NOT VOTING—71.

Anthony	Freeman	Kettner	Pou
Ashbrook	Fuller, Ill.	Kieess	Purnell
Babka	Goldfogle	King	Rainey, H. T.
Bland, Ind.	Goodall	Kitchin	Randall, Calif.
Britten	Greene, Vt.	Lee, Ga.	Reed, W. Va.
Browne	Griest	Linthicum	Sanders, La.
Brumbaugh	Griffin	Longworth	Scully
Caraway	Hamill	McArthur	Sims
Clark, Fla.	Heflin	McClintic	Sinclair
Copley	Hicks	McFadden	Slomp
Costello	Huddleston	Mann	Stephens, Miss.
Eagle	Hulings	Mason	Stiness
Echols	Hull, Tenn.	Monahan, Wis.	Sullivan
Emerson	Johnson, Wash.	Moore, Va.	Wattson, Va.
Evans, Mont.	Jones, Pa.	Neely	Wilson, Ill.
Evans, Nev.	Kahn	O'Connor	Wood, Ind.
Fairfield	Kendall	Peters	Woodyard
Flood	Kennedy, Iowa	Porter	

So the motion to adjourn was agreed to.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. KING with Mr. NEELY.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont with Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois with Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana.

Mr. EMERSON with Mr. RANDALL of California.

Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. SCULLY.

Mr. HICKS with Mr. O'CONNOR.

Mr. HULINGS with Mr. MOORE of Virginia.

Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. WATSON of Virginia.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. CARAWAY.

Mr. STINESS with Mr. EAGLE.

Mr. SLEMP with Mr. EVANS of Montana.

Mr. REED of West Virginia with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. PORTER with Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. PETERS with Mr. GRIFFIN.

Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. BABKA.

Mr. MASON with Mr. HEFLIN.

Mr. MCFADDEN with Mr. KETTNER.

Mr. MCARTHUR with Mr. HUDDLESTON.

Mr. KEISS with Mr. LINTHICUM.

Mr. BROWNE with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.

Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana with Mr. ASHBOOK.

Mr. MCFADDEN with Mr. GARRETT.

Mr. MANN with Mr. HULL of Tennessee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington with Mr. SIMS.

Mr. MONAHAN with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.

Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. POU.

Mr. PURNELL with Mr. MCCLINTIC.

Mr. GRIEST with Mr. DEWALT.

Mr. KENDALL with Mr. LEE of Georgia.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded. Accordingly the House (at 7 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, July 16, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 412) to incorporate Near East Relief, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 119), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEHLBACH, from the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3149) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 120), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 7343) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 7344) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lewiston, Me., one German cannon or minnerwerfer, and also two 6-inch Newton trench mortar guns, or two 58.2 French trench mortar guns, or two 2.40-millimeter French trench mortar guns; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 7345) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sherman, Tex., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 7346) to provide for the erection of a public building at Harlan, in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7347) to provide for the erection of a public building at Corbin, in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BLACK: A bill (H. R. 7348) to amend the second paragraph of section 10 of an act approved March 21, 1918, so that said paragraph as amended will authorize and direct the President, acting by and through the Director General of Railroads, to grant reduced rates over railroads under Federal control, one and one-third fare for round trip, to passengers attending conventions, meetings, or congresses of religious, charitable, and other organizations or associations enumerated in said paragraph as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 7349) for the relief of the heirs of the Eastern Cherokee Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 7350) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended by the act approved June 25, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 7351) to provide homes for soldiers, seamen, and marines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 7352) to amend section 5202 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by section 20, Title I, of the act approved April 5, 1918; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 7353) to donate to Wahoo, Nebr., one or more obsolete (though not disabled) or captured German cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 7354) to give officers or enlisted men who served during the emergency incident to the war with Germany credit for such service in computing their longevity pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7355) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Bellefonte, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7356) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Clearfield, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7357) to increase the cost of the public building at Dubois, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 7358) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Allen, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7359) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Tekonsha, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7360) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Galesburg, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7361) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Union City, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 7404) to repeal section 7 of the act of October 7, 1917, entitled "An act making appropriation to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. GOOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) to ratify and confirm, from and including July 1, 1919, obligations incurred pursuant to the terms of certain appropriations for the fiscal year 1920; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolution (H. Res. 177) requesting the United States Food Administration to make an investigation into the present price of flour; to the Committee on Agriculture.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 7362) granting an increase of pension to John Michel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7363) granting a pension to James M. Danner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRAND: A bill (H. R. 7364) granting a pension to John E. Harris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 7365) granting a pension to Henry Humphries; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: A bill (H. R. 7366) granting a pension to Annie M. Kimball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 7367) for the relief of Iver Boreson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 7368) for the relief of C. D. Pautler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 7369) granting an increase of pension to Conrad Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FISHER: A bill (H. R. 7370) for the relief of the legal representative of Enoch Ensley, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 7371) granting a pension to May Schwartz; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GANLY: A bill (H. R. 7372) granting a pension to Herman Lazarus; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 7373) to authorize the payment of \$2,000 to the widow of the late Tranquilino Luna; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 7374) granting a pension to Amanda Burlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7375) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Brady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MICHENER: A bill (H. R. 7376) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Dobbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7377) granting a pension to Margaret L. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7378) granting a pension to Hattie Lameaux; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 7379) granting an increase of pension to James S. Frizzell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7380) granting a pension to Mary J. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 7381) granting an increase of pension to Mary Lyons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7382) granting an increase of pension to James L. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 7383) granting an increase of pension to James D. Smallwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7384) granting an increase of pension to T. J. Rowlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7385) granting a pension to Ellis B. McNeeley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7386) granting a pension to Mary J. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7387) granting an increase of pension to John H. Dunkleburg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7388) granting an increase of pension to George E. Cowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 7389) granting a pension to Anna O'Brien; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 7390) granting a pension to Samuel Gilliland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7391) for the relief of Frederick B. Shaw; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 7392) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Lowery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7393) granting an increase of pension to Clement F. S. Aimes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7394) granting an increase of pension to Samuel R. Worick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7395) to correct the military record of John Minster; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 7396) granting an increase of pension to William Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 7397) granting an increase of pension to Rosanna Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 7398) granting an increase of pension to John W. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VARE: A bill (H. R. 7399) granting a pension to Mary Hart; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 7400) granting a pension to Cecil B. Jones and Pauline M. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 7401) granting a pension to John Degan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYS: A bill (H. R. 7402) granting an increase of pension to James McDaniel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 7403) granting a pension to Mrs. Ida B. Welker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of 2,000 Americans of Ukrainian descent, protesting the invasion of West Ukraine by the Polish Army; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition to amend article 10 in league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BABKA: Petition of the industrial medicine and surgery section of the American Medical Association, urging an appropriation of \$1,500,000 for investigation of causes, modes of transmission, prevention, and cure of influenza, pneumonia, and other diseases, available to July 1, 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Adams County, Pa., for repeal of tax on soda, soft drinks, ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. Burroughs: Telegrams from J. M. E. Badger; J. G. McMullen; W. H. Burns; H. M. Flinn; G. E. Burns; Anna M. Driscoll; H. O. Fanington, secretary Draftmen's Union; P. J. Browne, president Federal Employees' Union; Fred N. Staten, president Central Labor Union, all of Portsmouth, N. H., in opposition to the Good amendment to the Nolan bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Merrimack Lodge, No. 5, International Order of Good Templars, Manchester, N. H., by Bertha E. Magee, chief templar, and Gertrude E. Holmes, secretary, advocating the prompt enactment at this session of Congress of laws providing for the full enforcement of the eighteenth amendment to the



United States Constitution, and also definitely defining "intoxicating liquors"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 76 residents and voters of Manchester, N. H., advocating the prompt enactment at this session of Congress of laws providing for the full enforcement of the eighteenth amendment to the United States Constitution, and also definitely defining "intoxicating liquors"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAGO: Petition of officers of the One hundred and tenth Infantry and the Tenth Pennsylvania Infantry, protesting against the use of the name Twenty-eighth Division and the insignia thereof by any Regular Army unit; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of employees of the Boston Navy Yard, for 44-hour week standard and to grant the Saturday half holiday to its employees during the three summer months; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Pehr G. Holmes, mayor of Worcester, Mass., relative to the claims of Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of John Morton, chairman advisory committee, requesting the State Department to furnish to the United States Senate and to be published for the American people transcripts or copies of all conversations, conferences, negotiations, notes, and other correspondence or intercourse to which Great Britain and the United States have both been parties; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition favoring a liberal appropriation for the American Printing House for the Blind; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Anti-Saloon League of America, favoring effective legislation for the enforcement of war prohibition and constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of John Wood Post, No. 96, Department of Illinois, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the Fuller \$50 pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of 60 citizens of Mazon, Ill., favoring repeal of the tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition opposing continuance of the United States Employment Service as a permanent branch of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi: Petition of Castner's Drug Co. and 20 citizens of Long Beach, Miss., protesting against tax on sodas and confectioneries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Carr drug store and 19 citizens of Magee, Miss., protesting against tax on soft drinks, confectioneries, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNUTSON: Memorial of citizens of St. Cloud, Sauk Rapids, and Waite Park, Minn., for national ownership and Government operation of all railroads in the United States and its possessions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petitions of Federal Employees' Union No. 124, Annapolis, Md., and Federal Employees' Union No. 21, against the Good amendment to the Nolan minimum-wage bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Sylvester F. Carman and George A. O'Donnell, of Baltimore, Md., urging the passage of House bill 5418, relating to the printers, pressmen, and bookbinders; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, petition of G. A. Ogg, of Baltimore, Md., for legislation to enforce the constitutional amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Paul F. Due and other citizens of Baltimore, Md., against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of Foster Millburn Co., of Buffalo, N. Y., for legislation to permit alcohol absolutely necessary for medicines, toilet articles, and other bona fide preparations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mrs. Roselinda Lester and Mrs. Lena Kolf, of Buffalo, N. Y., urging the passage of the prohibition bill to define intoxicating liquors as all such liquors containing more than one-half of 1 per cent alcohol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of National Association of State Banks, urging the abolition of office of Comptroller of the Currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of the Empire Lodge of Good Templars, of Syracuse, N. Y., in favor of the prohibition-enforcement act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of E. W. Davis and several hundred other citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCANDREWS: Papers to accompany House bill 7316, granting an extension on United States of America letters patent No. 710997; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted at a meeting of the directors of the Wisconsin Game Protective Association, held in La Crosse, Wis., April 2, 1919, recommending appropriation for enforcement of migratory-bird law; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolution adopted by the Common Council of the city of Milwaukee, June 30, 1919, recommending that the wireless-ship act be amended to include all seafaring vessels carrying passengers and crews above a certain limit; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOONEY: Petition of J. H. Dulesky and others, for the repeal of the tax on sodas, ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the City Council of Cleveland, Ohio, in the matter of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Petition of the Common Council of Milwaukee, to amend the wireless-ship act; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Alfred Marling, Sam A. Lewisohn, and Charles B. Staats, all of New York, against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of James B. Gresham Post, No. 9, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of Los Angeles, Calif., protesting the reducing, by the board of managers of the national military homes, of the basic pay of all employees so that they do not receive the \$240 given to all Government employees as a bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the California Red Wood Association, San Francisco, Calif., protesting against Senate bills 374 and 692; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Milk Producers' Association, of San Diego County, indorsing Senator Capper's bill legalizing the organization of farmers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of J. M. Henderson, Sacramento, Calif., indorsing amendment to act of October 15, 1914, giving farmers the right to organize; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the California Manufacturers' Association, indorsing daylight saving; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the City Council of Los Angeles, Calif., indorsing daylight saving; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Associated Milk Producers of San Francisco, Calif., asking support of amendment to act of October 15, 1914, introduced by Senator Capper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin: Petition of Walter M. Burke, Simon Gottlieb, James Bailey, and 52 other citizens of Kenosha, Wis., requesting the repeal of section 904 of the revenue law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REBER: Petition of F. K. Barthe, of Tamaqua, Pa., carrying 99 signatures of residents of Schuylkill County, Pa., asking for repeal of the tax on candy, ice cream, sodas, and soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mrs. Joseph Schaeffer, of Frackville, Pa., carrying 85 signatures of residents of Schuylkill County, Pa., asking for the repeal of the tax on candy, ice cream, sodas, and soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Anthony Cernautskas and John A. Kasabes, of Tamaqua, Pa., asking the United States to demand the withdrawal of Polish troops from Lithuanian territory and to give to Lithuania a moral support in her war against Bolshevism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of 340 citizens of Kenton and Campbell Counties, Ky., urging the repeal of tax on sodas, ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Petition of Washington State Pharmaceutical Association, protesting against pending legislation seeking to reduce the alcoholic content of any medicated liquid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of employees of the Boston Navy Yard, for legislation for the establishment of the 44-hour week as the standard of employment for the employees of the United States Navy Department; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of the Merchant Tailors' Exchange of Philadelphia, asking that skilled laborers be given permission to enter the country, and that no measure be passed which will exclude them; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.